

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Institute of Philology  
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**BORIS JOHNSON AS A POLITICIAN AND WRITER: LINGUISTIC  
IDENTITY**

*Master's Thesis*  
*written by the 2<sup>nd</sup> year student*  
*of master's programme*  
*“Modern English Communication*  
*and Translation and Two*  
*Western European Languages”*  
*Field of Science – 03 “Humanities”*  
*Specialty – 035 “Philology”*  
**Ladna Nadiia Vadymivna**

Supervised by:

**Neborsina Nataliia Pavlivna, PhD**

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології  
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 11 від 24.05.2021

Завідувач кафедри \_\_\_\_\_ проф. Белова А.Д.

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF LINGUISTIC IDENTITY STUDY.....	6
1.1 Theory of linguistic identity, its origin and development.....	6
1.2 Linguistic identity as an object of research within Modern Linguistics. Directions of studying linguistic identity.....	13
1.3 Linguistic identities of politicians.....	21
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1 .....	25
CHAPTER 2. BORIS JOHNSON’S LINGUISTIC IDENTITY MANIFESTED IN HIS SPEECHES .....	27
2.1. Communicative competence level .....	27
2.2 Cognitive level .....	35
2.3 Pragmatic (motivational) level.....	43
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2 .....	52
CHAPTER 3. FEATURES OF BORIS JOHNSON’S LINGUISTIC IDENTITY IN WRITTEN DISCOURSE.....	54
3.1 Verbal-semantic level .....	54
3.2 Cognitive level .....	58
3.3 Pragmatic (motivational) level.....	66
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3 .....	75
CONCLUSIONS.....	77
REFERENCES.....	80
SUPPORTING MATERIALS .....	88

## INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, researchers are paying more attention to the study of mutual influence of language and society, language and personality. Linguists note the anthropocentricity of the language. In this regard, the study of the linguistic identity has become one of the promising directions in linguistics.

Since 1980s the problem of identity manifestation in language has been actively studied by philosophers, psychologists, and linguists. The theory of linguistic identity is based on the works of V. Vinogradov, Yu. Karaulov and G. Bogin. In modern linguistics, G. Bogin (1986), Yu. Karaulov (1987, 2010), S. Vorkachev (2001), V. Karasik (2002), V. Neroznak and others are engaged in the study of the linguistic identity.

It should be noted that this theoretical frame is developed primarily by Russian linguists. This area of language research is scarcely represented by the work of English-speaking linguists. Among the Ukrainian researchers working with this theory, one can mention L. Slavova, L. Matsko, S. Kuranova, M. Pentilyuk, L. Marchuk and others. In recent years, linguistic research has been carried out on the linguistic identity of a politician, TV presenter, translator, writer, teacher, scientist, etc.

This study deals with the linguistic identity of the British politician and author Boris Johnson, one of the most prominent political figures of recent years. The personality of Boris Johnson is actively studied from the standpoint of political discourse based on the material of his public speeches. Unfortunately, his literary works have not been studied from the linguistic perspective.

**The relevance of the research** is determined by the need to further develop the theory of linguistic identity, within the framework of which this research was carried out; insufficient study of the literary work of Boris Johnson from the standpoint of linguistics; lack of a comprehensive linguistic analysis of his texts, which are rich and diverse linguistic material for semantic, stylistic,

cognitive and pragmatic analysis; lack of scientific works devoted to the study of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson.

**The novelty of the work.** The comprehensive description of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson; the choice as an object of study of the linguistic identity of the writer, whose literary work has not been subject to linguistic analysis.

**The aim of the research.** To reconstruct the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson based on the material of his speeches and literary texts.

**Research objectives.** The tasks are formed in accordance with the three-level model of the linguistic identity by Yu. Karaulov, which served as the basis for the analysis.

- to form a theoretical basis for the study of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson;
- to study the verbal-semantic level of Johnson's linguistic identity (semantic analysis through the study of semantic groups and semantic anomalies);
- to explore the cognitive level of Johnson's linguistic identity (the most important features of his language picture of the world through the analysis of the conceptual spheres of his texts);
- to analyse the pragmatic (motivational) level of Johnson's linguistic identity (communicative strategies and tactics and the specifics of their implementation).

**The object of the research.** The linguistic identity of Boris Johnson as a politician and writer.

**The subject of the research.** analysis of the mechanisms of functioning of the verbal-semantic, cognitive and pragmatic level of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson in his speeches and writing.

**The corpus** consists of the texts of public speeches from the time period of 2008-2021 that were delivered by Boris Johnson from the positions of Mayor of London, Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister and constitute a corpus of 35,000

words; and the fragments (the initial and final chapters) of Boris Johnson's four non-fiction books: "The Churchill Factor", "Life in the Fast Lane", "Have I Got Views for You" and "Johnson's Life of London" so as to create a corpus of roughly 35,000 words to equal the corpus of selected speeches and ensure the compatibility of the results.

**Research methods** are continuous sampling method; the method of scientific description, which is used to display all three levels of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson; the method of structural modeling (according to Yu. Karaulov), which involves the reconstruction of each of the three levels of the linguistic identity; the method of conceptual analysis, which is used to study the cognitive level (when identifying cognitive models of concepts); context analysis method; elements of quantitative analysis; biographical method, which is used to establish the factors that determined the formation of the author's linguistic identity.

**The significance.** The theoretical significance of the thesis lies in the fact that its results make a certain contribution to the development of the theory of linguistic identity, deepen the understanding of the linguistic identity of the multidimensional personality, expand the scope of its study. The practical significance of the study lies in the fact that its results can be used for further research in this field, as well as in the educational process to study the structure of linguistic identity. The proposed way of analysis can also be used in the study of the linguistic identity of other multidimensional personalities.

**The structure.** The work consists of an introduction, three chapters, conclusions and references that include illustrative material. The first chapter is theoretical, while the second and the third ones are concerned with the practical analysis of the material. In the second chapter the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson is studied on the basis of his public speeches. In the third chapter Johnson's linguistic identity manifested in his literary works is analysed.

# CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF LINGUISTIC IDENTITY STUDY

## 1.1 Theory of linguistic identity, its origin and development

In the second part of the 20th century, there was a shift from structuralism to an anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics. This shift determined the following directions in the development of linguistics: communicative linguistics, linguistic conceptology, cognitive linguistics, linguopersonology, cultural linguistics, sociolinguistics, etc.

It should be noted that this division has conditional nature due to the possibility to use several approaches and methodologies simultaneously. In addition, the new paradigm also provides an interdisciplinary approach that expands the subject-object field of linguistics science. One of the new subjects of study is a combination of different linguistic, cultural and behavioral features that constitutes a linguistic identity of a person or a group of people.

In Western linguistics, the image of a representative of a linguistic community has become the subject of study in anthropological linguistics. The realization that a linguistic community has a certain set of qualities that distinguishes it from the rest and influences the identities of its members made it necessary to formulate the concept of identity in the framework of anthropological linguistics. The study of linguistic identity is one of the most complex problems of modern linguistics.

Speaking of Western linguistics, the foundations of the theory of linguistic identity were laid, among other things, in the works of M. Bucholtz and K. Hall. They define identity as “the social positioning of self and other” [66, p. 586] through language. According to them, the mechanism for realizing identity includes a number of principles: Emergence, Positionality, Indexicality, Relationality and Partialness [66].

The first principle states that people's self-awareness is realized in the form of discourse, therefore, for the realization of identity, specific conditions of linguistic interaction are necessary, identity arises only in a socio-cultural context. The Positionality principle presupposes a system of characteristics for building identity: gender, age, social class, ethnic and cultural characteristics, constancy or variability of the interactional role. Indexicality means the possibility of labeling (indexing) identities through stances, styles, or linguistic structures and systems. The principle of Relationality is that identity is not an isolated entity and acquires social meaning only through interacting with other identities in the course of discourse. Partialness means that identity is not homogeneous, it is partly intentional, partly habitual, in part a result of social interactions, in part an outcome of big ideological processes, etc.[66]

Each linguistic form at all levels correlates with social values, cultural values and landmarks. In the course of communication, a set of interaction norms accepted in the group is used [66, p. 596]. Thus, identity is the ability of a group member to understand symbols and codes in the sense in which they are understood by other members of the group in a given context [15, p. 20].

Bucholtz and Hall [66] also give a general description of the relationship between language and identity. They explore two sub-concepts that constitute the concept of Identity: “sameness” and “difference”. According to them, “sameness” is what gives members of a community an opportunity to perceive themselves as part of a group, whereas “difference” is what marks a distance between individuals in the group.

D. Block [65] in his language and identity research talks about the phenomenon of language identity, associating it with language expertise, language affiliation, and language inheritance. By expertise he means the person's level of language proficiency. Affiliation means the way a speaker sees a particular language and how they treat it. Inheritance refers to a community that is associated with a particular language and how it influences the speaker's identity.

Another approach to studying identity and language was given by J. Edwards [71]. Edwards argues that depending on the context of communication, the individual can wear different “masks”. Despite this diversity, the boundaries of identities are maintained by the sense of separateness (“difference”) of the social group members. According to Edwards, connections between linguistic and non-linguistic features of the group create a “linguistic portrait” (however, he does not perceive this phrase as a term).

Further studies regarding the relationship between language and identity (R. Lippi-Green, J.P. Gee, B. Norton) [72] developed the idea that speech is a universal marker of belonging to the group and a means of expressing this belonging. However, unlike the works of Eastern European linguists, Western anthropological linguistics treats linguistic identity as a means of expression, rather than as a separate entity.

It should also be noted that when analyzing the relationship between identity and language, a descriptive approach is used without introducing additional research units. The theory of the relationship between language and identity in Western linguistics is used primarily in works on pedagogy (teaching English to migrants and mastering a second language), which is singled out in foreign applied linguistics as a separate discipline (linguodidactics). Within this framework, there were experiments targeted at reconstructing the linguistic identity of bilinguals or migrants, the functional realization of linguistic identity under the influence of various attitudes and motives was analyzed [72].

Canadian researcher B. Norton argues that identity is how a person realizes their relationship with the world, how these relationships are formed under the influence of time and space, and what prospects for the development of these relationships they see in the future [72, p. 5].

While researching immigrant women studying English in Canada, Norton denies that migrants’ identities are static. In her research, she demonstrates how the

communicative behavior of students of language courses changes depending on various factors. Norton notes that ethnicity, gender, and class are not separate variables, but inextricably linked elements involved in the construction of identity [72, p. 13].

Along with Norton, S.-L. Wong and S.L. McKay were also engaged in the study of identity in the linguistic aspect. They studied the identity change of Chinese students in the United States, noting the varying degrees of interest in learning the four basic language skills (reading, speaking, writing, listening).

The trend towards interdisciplinarity led to the fact that the description of linguistic identity in Western anthropolinguistics shifted from linguistic characteristics to cultural, psychological, social, and behavioral ones. In addition to linguistic facts, the focus of the study constitutes also the extralinguistic context, social roles, cultural affiliation, behavioral characteristics of speakers, etc. Such extralinguistic direction of research can be explained by the focus on solving applied problems, in particular, in linguodidactics. For this reason, the analysis of identity in Western anthropolinguistics and the concept of linguistic identity have remained unconceptualized and uncategorized [15, p. 21]. However, it should be noted that within the framework of linguodidactics, which deals with the issues of mastering a second language, attempts were made to describe the model of hybrid identity.

Linguistic identity was conceptualized in Eastern European linguistics. In contrast to the works of Western anthropolinguistics, Eastern European researchers have focused on a detailed description and understanding of the set of unique cultural and linguistic characteristics, values, knowledge and behavioral responses as a separate dimension of identity.

The term “linguistic identity” is just beginning to be reflected in linguistic terminology, and in scientific research there is no uniform interpretation of it. If we turn to the origins of the use of this phrase, then for the first time the term

“linguistic identity” was used by V. Vinogradov in the context of analyzing the relationship between the individual and the general public in the language of fiction. Vinogradov explained the term in the following way: “the study of the author's individual style, their place and function in the system of literature of a certain time, correlation with other styles makes it possible to present the author as a linguistic identity - an identity, expressed in language and through language, which can be recreated on the basis of the linguistic means used by it” [8, p. 24]. However, V. Vinogradov does not give an interpretation of the linguistic identity as a linguistic term [9, p. 61].

The first definition of a linguistic identity was proposed by G. Bogin. He defined it as a person viewed from the perspective of his or her readiness to perform, create and receive speech acts [40].

However, the concept of linguistic identity was most clearly formulated by Yu. Karaulov. He defined it as the totality of capabilities for the creation and perception of texts of different structural and linguistic complexity, depth and accuracy of the reflection of reality, and target [28, p. 245]. It should be also noted that Karaulov gives another definition of linguistic identity, stating that it is an identity expressed in language (texts) and through language, reconstructed in its main features on the basis of linguistic means [28, p. 38].

Thus, according to him, linguistic identity is both a person's linguistic abilities and the result of their implementation; it is a conceptual entity that belongs to the linguistic realm and a set of communicative attitudes, values and language skills that form the psychological dimension of identity.

Yu. Karaulov developed a model of linguistic identity which consists of verbal-semantic, cognitive, and motivational (or pragmatic) levels. Each level has specific typical elements (level units) and connections between them. So, the units of the verbal-semantic (or structural-system) level are words used as a means of expressing certain meanings, a tool for expressing ideas. The cognitive level (or

the thesaurus) is the level of ideas and concepts; it correlates with the picture of the world. The cognitive level of linguistic identity covers both the area of linguistic knowledge and the sphere of concepts and connections between them. The units of the motivational (pragmatic) level are communicative needs, in other words, motives, interests, attitudes, intentions and goals that determine the communicative behavior of a person. Karaulov emphasizes that all three levels are not isolated, they are interconnected and constitute one mechanism [28, p. 36]. As noted by M. Kitaygorodskaya, individual levels do not have identification power individually, but together they form a “mosaic of speech”, in other words, a unique linguistic identity [29, p. 52].

Some linguists (e.g. V. Chudinov [59]) criticize the term “linguistic identity”, since language proficiency is merely one of the characteristics of an identity, hence other similar terms: “speech identity” [51], “communicative identity” [33], “vocabulary identity” [24], [10], “speech portrait” [60], [41], [2], “speech image” [16], “idiostyle” [64]. However, the term “linguistic identity” became more widespread than the terms listed above.

The term “linguistic identity” can be used to denote the speech characteristics of both a certain community of people and an individual representative of this community. The idea of the dual nature of the linguistic identity was first mentioned in the work of N. Trubetsky [56] and became widespread in the works of V. Neroznak, which distinguishes “multihuman (polylectal)” and “private human (ideolectic)” linguistic identity [43]. A. Vorozhbitova divides this classification even further offering two terms: collective linguistic identity which is the identity of representatives of an entire ethnos or nationality; and group linguistic identity which is the identity of a separate social group within this ethnos or nationality [17, pp. 28-29].

Thus, there are two approaches in describing a linguistic identity: in the center of the first one is a specific individual, the subject of the second one is a

collective image of all speakers of a language or speakers of a specific group. [1, pp. 14-15].

In addition to the direction and object of research of the linguistic identity (communicative linguistics, sociolinguistics, linguistic conceptology), research methods also vary. The methodology developed by sociolinguists (M. Kitaigorodskaya, N. Rozanova [29]) is aimed at extracting “diagnostic” information from an array of general standard parameters, which is a unique linguistic sign of a person's belonging to a particular group [29, p. 4]. Communicative linguistics in the study of a linguistic identity puts the behavioral aspect in the foreground [4], [31], [52], [38].

To summarize, the concept of “linguistic identity”, which appeared in the 30s of the twentieth century, in the 90s of the twentieth century, becomes a pivotal system-forming philological concept. Now the phenomenon of linguistic identity is acquiring a categorical status in science. Most researchers currently assess this term as integrative, which served as the beginning of a new stage in the development of anthropolinguistics [31, p. 15]. The study of this phenomenon in a number of areas of scientific research - linguodidactics and psycholinguistics, the stylistics of artistic speech and cultural linguistics, communicative linguistics and linguopersonology - is evidence of the extreme demand for referring to the “human factor” in the language, marking the anthropological perspective of research.

## **1.2 Linguistic identity as an object of research within Modern Linguistics. Directions of studying linguistic identity**

The study of a linguistic identity is one of the most complex and multifaceted objects of research within modern linguistics. The theory of linguistic identity is developed in the works of K. Sedov [52], S. Vorkachev [10], E. Ivantsova [19], N. Goleva [11], V. Karasik [25], I. Synytsiia [54] and others.

In the theory of linguistic identity, which is being actively developed in modern linguistics, there are different ways to interpret this basic concept. According to G. Bogin, a linguistic identity is a person as a speaker, taken from the perspective of his ability to participate in a speech act [5]. For Yu. Karaulov it is the identity of the author who, using his thesaurus, creates texts based on individual knowledge about the world; a speaker of one or another language, characterized on the basis of the texts produced by them from the point of view of using the tools of a given language to reflect their vision of the surrounding reality [26]. Karasik defines linguistic identity as a person participating in communication [23]. According to L. Klobukova, it is a multi-layered and multicomponent paradigm of linguistic identities that can be found in different communicative and linguistic subsystems and use them depending on certain social functions of communication [30], etc.

When studying a linguistic identity, researchers characterize a person's ability to speak and think. In this regard, various concepts have emerged that reveal the essence of a linguistic identity as a linguistic category: polylectic and idiolective identity [43]; linguistic and speech identity [30]; ethnosemantics, speech and communicative identity [33], [10], [24]; elite linguistic identity [31]; linguistic identities of Western and Eastern cultures [55] and others.

It should be noted that such a division of a linguistic identity into different types is relatively notional and caused by the need for a specialised scientific research of a linguistic identity. As many linguists note, a person can act as an

ethnosemantic (or linguistic), speech and communicative identity simultaneously. The concept of a linguistic identity combines philosophical, psychological, sociological, cognitive and culturological views on a person, which explains the ambiguity of the interpretation of this term.

In linguistic research in recent years, different approaches to the study of the linguistic identity have been used. Thus, V.I. Karasik identified such areas of the study of the linguistic identity as psychological, sociological, cultural and linguistic [25, p. 96]. I. Synytsiia divided the existing works on the linguistic identity into two main groups in accordance with the orientation towards the principles of analysis proposed by V. Vinogradov or Yu. Karaulov [53, p. 40–41]; [32]. The study of the linguistic identity is carried out in the psycholinguistic (A. Zalevskaya, V. Belyanin, etc.), linguodidactic (G. Bogin, Yu. Karaulov, V. Karasik, T. Snitko, S. Vorkachev and others), sociolinguistic (L. Krysin, O. Kazakova, E. Ivantsova, I. Sinitsaidr) and linguopoetic (R. Yakobson, V. Grigoriev, N. Kozhevnikova, N. Bolotnova and others) directions.

The linguistic identity is also studied from the point of view of gender, manifested at the language level. Recently, a number of linguistic studies have appeared on the problem of constructing the author's gender identity (M. Bragina, G. Ivanchenko, O. Kozachishina, N. Fateeva, etc.), but this problem remains understudied.

There is a need to elaborate on the most popular aspects of the analysis of a linguistic identity listed above, which correspond to various linguistic disciplines.

The stylistic aspect is presented in the study of a linguistic identity in an artistic or journalistic text. This aspect involves the analysis of idiosyle - the system of individual preferences of the author of the text against the background of general language use [48], [35].

In the sociolinguistic aspect, the influence of the environment on a person's speech is studied, as well as the most common types of speakers in society, which differ in profession, occupation, level of education, social status, etc. [34]

The psycholinguistic aspect involves identifying the features of the generation and perception of speech, as well as the correlation between the psychological characteristics of a person and the originality of his speech behavior [18], [37].

The cognitive aspect is associated with the study of the linguistic picture of the world through the analysis of the thesaurus [27], [3].

The linguocultural aspect is focused on the analysis of the national and cultural characteristics of the linguistic identity. First of all, the specificity of the mentality and the linguistic picture of the world is considered [39], [27].

The pragmatic aspect involves the analysis of a linguistic identity from the standpoint of communicative linguistics and pragmatics. It focuses on speech behavior, its stereotypes, communicative strategies and tactics of the individual [45], [21].

The rhetorical aspect includes the study of a linguistic identity from the standpoint of the level of speech culture and rhetoric (mastery of speech genres, speech technique of argumentation). In this case, the degree of the individual's language proficiency is investigated [17].

In the linguodidactic aspect, the problems of the formation of a linguistic identity in the process of teaching a native or foreign language are studied [5], [30].

The lexicographic aspect of the study is associated with the vocabulary systematization of the idiolect of a particular linguistic identity.

The linguopersonalological aspect, the main goal of which is the systemic reconstruction of the linguistic identity in accordance with the idea of its structure. So, using the three-level structural model by Yu. Karaulov, O. Shevchenko analyzes the linguistic identity of the translator using the material of the discourse of B. Zakhodera [62], N. Burmakina reconstructs the cognitive and pragmatic levels of the linguistic identity of the writer A. Stepanov [6], L. Karakuts-Borodina presents an analysis of the linguistic identity of V. Nabokov [22]. The number of works performed in the linguopersonalological aspect is increasing [57].

Despite the increased interest in the influence of the human factor on the language, linguistic identity is a new direction in linguistics that is at the stage of formation. Therefore, the theoretical and methodological apparatus of the theory of linguistic identity is still in the process of developing. Methods used in studying linguistic identities are both general scientific and linguistic, there are also the methods of scientists, specialists in this field of linguistics, including Yu. Karaulov's method of structural modeling, V. Druzhinina, A. Vorozhbitova's method of linguistic reconstruction, O. Issers's method of communicative portraiture, K. Sedov's method of genesis portraiture.

Thus, the method of the analysis and description is the actual problem of the theory of linguistic identity. So, in his works V. Vinogradov presents some "experiments in describing" the author's linguistic identity. G. Vinokur, emphasizing the close relationship between language and identity, singled out two types of analysis: from a person to their language - "the study of the author's language in projection onto their biography" - and from language to a person - the study of the relationship "between the author's language and their identity" with the aim of disclosure of the author's psychology, their inner world [12].

If we are to mention the most common method in linguopersonology, then it is Yu. Karaulov's method. It has a certain degree of generalization, which makes it possible to study a particular linguistic identity in terms of a national, social or individual model. The model of a linguistic identity is divided, as was mentioned

before, into three levels: 1) verbal-semantic (the lexicon of an individual, the vocabulary of words and phrases that are used in the process of communication; individuality is determined by the variability of word use, the subjective choice of linguistic means of various levels, the degree of violations of a given language's normative rules); 2) cognitive (a set of ideas about reality, reflecting the characteristics of an individual worldview); 3) motivational (or pragmatic) (interests, intentions, motives and communicative attitudes of a speaker or an author). This model allows us to consider various signs of a linguistic identity within the framework of three essential characteristics - linguistic, cognitive and motivational.

So, the variability of approaches to the concept of linguistic identity leads to a plurality of methods for studying the phenomenon that needs to be systematized. In studying linguistic identity, general scientific and proper linguistic methods are used. Among the general scientific methods, the most frequently used are the inductive method, the lexicographic method, the methods of mathematical linguistics, the most common among which is the method of analyzing the formal characteristics of the text [25, pp. 33-34].

The inductive method is implemented in studies of linguistic identity as an approach from the text to the author. The method of scientific (linguistic) description, involves the classification of linguistic units and explanation of the principles of their structure and functioning [36]. The lexicographic method makes it possible to show different properties of language units; it is used to create writers' dictionaries.

Methods of mathematical linguistics are used to determine the characteristics of an individual style, namely, to establish the authorship of texts [25, p. 34]. Among those methods the most popular is the method for analyzing the formal characteristics of a text: the analysis of the length of a sentence, the ratio of words of each part of speech to the total number of word usage [25, p. 34]. Its

disadvantage is that it can only be used for texts consisting of several thousand units.

Linguistic methods for studying the linguistic identity differ depending on the analyzed material (written texts or oral speech), as a result they can be divided into two main groups. The first is the method of reconstruction of the linguistic identity based on written texts which is usually used to describe a generalized linguistic identity, involving the recreation of implicit components of the appearance of a linguistic identity (data of an extra-linguistic level or deep characteristics of the thesaurus and pragmatics). It includes the method of structural modeling, linguistic reconstruction and biographical method; and speech (or language) portrait based on oral speech and/ or directly observable facts [25, p. 39].

Speech portrait involves a layer-by-layer description of the linguistic identity of a speaker, features of their speech behavior (manner and speed of speech, voice volume, articulation), biographical information about them. This method has a sociolinguistic orientation, therefore, the individual's speech is analyzed from the point of view of a combination of individual and collective features, with an emphasis on the latter (e.g. S Nikitina's, E Zemskoy's and R.F. Kasatkina's speech portraits of the emigrants of the first wave and their descendants in the USA and Western Europe).

Unlike a sociolinguistic speech portrait, a communicative portrait, developed by O. Issers, focuses on the individual characteristics of the person's speech behavior.

Speech portraits can be complex (including characteristics of all layers of the subject's language system), as well as simple (considering only one of the layers, for example, phonetics, vocabulary or grammar).

The researchers in this field also use the genesis portraiture technique proposed by K. Sedov. Its task is to establish connections between the features of

the subject's speech and the reasons that determine the originality of these features [52]. L. Nefedova applies genesis portraiture to examine the speech portrait of the politician N. Sarkozy, created by the French media [44].

Among the methods specific to linguistic personology, our research uses the method of structural modeling, linguistic reconstruction, and the biographical method. The most widespread method is structural modeling, developed on the basis of the three-level model of the linguistic identity of Yu. Karaulov.

Many researchers use the method of structural modeling. The method of structural modeling is highly appreciated, since almost any variant of describing a linguistic identity ultimately pursues the goal of building its model, modeling is the most productive and therefore popular method of studying a linguistic identity [46, p. 21]. This method also allows the linguistic description to achieve a high level of abstraction, to generalize the variety of specific material in the foreseeable classifications. The problems of applying this method are that the boundaries between the levels of a linguistic identity are not clear, therefore it is difficult to study each level separately [14].

V. Druzhinina and A. Vorozhbitova proposed a method of linguistic reconstruction for the analysis of a linguistic identity, accessible only from its written heritage. This method assumes 1) “primary reconstruction” based on the text array of the linguistic identity and its self-characteristics in letters, diaries, interviews, and 2) “secondary reconstruction” based on research works, testimonies of colleagues and relatives [17].

The biographical method contains elements of "primary reconstruction". It is borrowed from literary criticism and its application is possible for the linguistic identity of the writer. This method is an analysis of personal written documents: letters, diaries, handwritten albums, editorial texts, works of art in order to obtain from them sociological data about the subject [34, p. 83].

To summarize, the popularity of the study of linguistic identity is explained by the synthesizing nature of this concept, reflecting the interdisciplinarity of modern anthropolinguistics and the integration of its various areas in the study of the phenomenon under consideration. The term “linguistic personality” is just beginning to gain momentum, and there is no single interpretation of it in scientific research [19].

Linguistic identity is studied in psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguodidactics, linguocognitology, cultural linguistics and linguopoetics, but first of all it became the main object of research in a new integrative branch of linguistics - linguistic personology, or linguopersonology [43].

The general scientific methods used in linguistic personology are the inductive method, the lexicographic method and the method of analyzing the formal characteristics of the text. The linguistic methods of studying linguistic identity include the method of reconstruction (method of structural modeling, linguistic reconstruction, biographical method), speech portrait (complex and simple (level-by-level) speech portrait; communicative portrait; genesis portrait). The most commonly used method for studying linguistic identity is structural modeling.

### **1.3 Linguistic identities of politicians**

When studying linguistic identity the most accessible for observation is the sphere of professional public speech. [20, p. 111]. This is the reason for the emergence of scientific research on the linguistic identity of media personalities: a politician, a journalist, television and radio host, etc. Active textual activity in the media environment, the possibility of regular observation of the object of research, relatively free access to information about life, interests, worldview of public people allow studying not only the speech material of a linguistic identity, but also extralinguistic factors that can influence the choice of linguistic means.

The object of our scientific research is the linguistic identity of a politician. In recent years, there has been an increased interest in political communication. Paying primary attention to how the language functions in the process of communication and how the linguistic personality is actualized in the language, linguists drew attention to such an important area as politics [40, p. 203]. Thus, political communication is in the center of attention of researchers and is one of the new and very promising research objects in the field of modern linguistics.

Interpreting linguistic data in an activity such as politics requires an interdisciplinary approach. Interdisciplinarity expands the understanding of the object of research and expands the list of areas where the results of the analysis can be applied (journalism, intercultural communication, translation, political management, Interpreting linguistic data in an activity such as politics requires an interdisciplinary approach. Interdisciplinarity expands the understanding of the object of research and expands the list of areas where the results of the analysis can be applied (journalism, intercultural communication, translation, political management, conflictology, etc.).

The linguistic identity of a politician is studied first and foremost on the basis of political discourse theory (e.g. [70], [61], [63], [69]). Political communication is known to be focused on propaganda and emotional impact. The

main function of this type of communication is the struggle for power: political communication is designed to have a direct or indirect impact on the distribution of power. Political communication reflects the existing political reality and changes with it. Political communication not only conveys information, but also has an emotional impact on the addressee, transforms the political picture of the world existing in the mind of a person.

In the course of studying the linguistic identity of a politician, the following typical features can be distinguished that unite them with other types of linguistic identities: a politician is a person of a certain age; a specific gender; from a specific region; engaged in a specific professional activity and adhering to some political views. There are also a number of differentiating features that distinguish a politician from a number of other identity types according to such criteria as engaging in politics as a professional activity, belonging to a political institution, performing some political functions, etc. [58, p. 104]

A politician acts as a subject of individual discourse (a politician as a unique linguistic identity), and as a subject of institutional discourse (a politician as a representative of a certain social institution). The linguistic identity of a politician is a phenomenon in which both supra-individual and individual traits are manifested through different texts with varying degrees of intensity. The study of texts allows us to consider the linguistic identity of a politician as a dynamic phenomenon, which is expressed in the three-level structure of a linguistic identity proposed by Yu. Karaulov: the verbal-semantic level, which reflects the person's command of the lexical and grammatical fund of the language, cognitive, representing the linguistic picture of the world, and pragmatic, which includes a system of motives and goals which the personality adheres to in the process of communication [27].

Considering the linguistic identity of a politician as a dynamic phenomenon, it is incredibly important to study the totality of communicative strategies and tactics intertwined in their speech discourse. Among the strategies and tactics, one

can distinguish both universal ones that distinguish a politician from other types of linguistic identity and impose restrictions on a given linguistic identity; and individual strategies and tactics.

The universal strategy of a politician is a persuasive strategy aimed at achieving the main goal of political communication - victory in the struggle for power. All these features cannot but affect the nature of the strategies and tactics used by politicians in their professional political activities, for example, the strategy of self-presentation, implemented through tactics of self-justification, tactics of positive self-evaluation, and the strategy of discrediting the opponent, implemented through tactics of accusation and tactics of threat [58, p. 105].

One of the possible approaches to the study of the linguistic identity of a politician can be a complex analysis of both the features of a typical politician and the individual linguistic identity of a politician. A certain use of the language is explained by the fact that from the whole variety of language each linguistic identity chooses the means that correspond to stable connections between concepts in its thesaurus and thus express, according to Yu. Karaulov, the individual's eternal, unshakable truths, to a large extent reflecting, and therefore determining their life credo. [27, p. 35]

When studying the identity of a politician, we proceed from the fact that it is an interactive identity with a system of universal and individual characteristics that was formed in the processes of communication and leave their traces in the created texts [9].

Thus, when studying the system and structure of the linguistic identity of a politician, it should be borne in mind that both political discourse and linguistic identity are dynamic phenomena of a syncretic nature [58, p. 107]. The syncretic nature of the linguistic identity lies in the fact that it acts and manifests itself in the field of discursive practice. Also, when analysing a politician's linguistic identity,

it should be taken into account that political discourse is the area of implementation of speech strategies and tactics [58, p. 107].

One of the possible approaches to the study of the linguistic identity of a politician can be a complex analysis of both the features of a typical politician and the individual linguistic identity of a politician. A certain use of the language is explained by the fact that from the whole variety of language each linguistic identity chooses the means that correspond to stable connections between concepts in its thesaurus and thus express, according to Yu.Karaulov, the individual's eternal, unshakable truths, to a large extent reflecting, and therefore determining their life credo [27, p. 35].

When studying the identity of a politician, we proceed from the fact that it is an interactive identity with a system of universal and individual characteristics that was formed in the processes of communication and leave their traces in the created texts [9].

Thus, when studying the system and structure of the linguistic identity of a politician, it should be borne in mind that both political discourse and linguistic identity are dynamic phenomena of a syncretic nature [58, p.106]. The syncretic nature of the linguistic identity lies in the fact that it acts and manifests itself in the field of discursive practice. Also, when analysing a politician's linguistic identity, it should be taken into account that political discourse is the area of implementation of speech strategies and tactics [58, p. 108].

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1

Due to the enormous attention of modern linguists to anthropology, linguistic identity becomes an important and widespread philological concept. When studying linguistic identity researches try to combine the data of many scientific disciplines that study a person (e.g. linguodidactics, psycholinguistics, communicative linguistics, cultural linguistics, etc.)

The linguists who study linguistic identity are preoccupied with factors that determine the individuality of a person's language, the typology of linguistic identities, types of sources for the study of a linguistic identity and methodological foundations of the analysis of a linguistic identity.

Linguistic identity can be studied using various universal and linguistic methods: the lexicographic method, the inductive method, and the method of analyzing the formal characteristics of the text, the method of reconstruction (method of linguistic reconstruction, structural modeling and biographical method), the method of speech portrait. The method of structural modeling (Yu. Karaulov's method) is most commonly used since it is the most representative and convenient to use.

Linguistic identity can be reconstructed based on the three-level model developed by Yu. Karaulov, consisting of verbal-semantic, linguo-cognitive and motivational levels. On the verbal-semantic level the vocabulary of an individual, its variability, the subjective choice of linguistic means and the degree of violations of language rules are studied. The cognitive level is connected to the person's worldview, usually studied by analyzing the conceptual sphere. On the motivational (or pragmatic) level the person's motives, intentions, interests and attitudes are analysed. This model creates the framework of three main characteristics: lexical, cognitive and pragmatic.

When it comes to studying the linguistic identity of a politician, it should be noted that one of the possible ways to study it is taking into account both typical

professional and individual features. The researcher should also bear in mind that political discourse is the area of implementation of communicative strategies and tactics which should be taken into consideration when analyzing linguistic identity on the pragmatic level.

## **CHAPTER 2. BORIS JOHNSON'S LINGUISTIC IDENTITY MANIFESTED IN HIS SPEECHES**

### **2.1. Communicative competence level**

As stated in the previous section, Yu. Karaulov's model of linguistic identity was chosen for this research. As it was repeatedly mentioned above, characterizing the structure of a linguistic identity, Yu.N. Karaulov distinguishes three levels in it: 1) the verbal-semantic (structural-linguistic) level; 2) linguistic and cognitive level; 3) pragmatic (motivational) level.

However, given the specifics of the context of the material chosen for analysis in this section (political speeches that represent an example of professional communication), it makes sense to talk about a professional linguistic personality as a set of linguistic competencies, taking into account the requirements of the profession, the goals of professional activity and the desire for professional self-realization.

With regard to the structure of linguistic professional identity, there is a slightly different approach to dividing it into levels. S. Myskin suggests considering the communicative-competence level instead of the verbal-semantic (structural-linguistic) level [42]. The author explains such a change in the structure of the analysis of a linguistic identity by the fact that in professional interaction, subject's use of language is determined by the requirements of a professional role, and in this regard, the researcher does not see the need for a separate identification of the verbal-semantic level when characterizing a linguistic identity in its professional environment. Here we can refer to the words of Yu. Karaulov, who wrote that the roots of the linguistic identity lie in the thesaurus (cognitive level), rather than in the verbal-semantic (structural-linguistic) level [27, p. 176].

Thus, at the first level of analysis, we will assess not so much the degree of proficiency in linguistic knowledge and skills, but rather the linguistic competence

of the research subject [42, p. 65]. Competence is a qualification characteristic of an individual taken at the moment of his inclusion in the activity [42, p. 66].

Speaking about the linguistic professional identity, in this case, the formation of communicative competence comes to the foreground, which is considered as a category that belongs to the sphere of relations between knowledge and practical activity of a person. At this stage of the research, we are guided by the works of R. Campbell and R. Wells, who define communicative competence as “...the ability to produce or understand utterances which are not so much grammatical but, more important, appropriate to the context in which they are made” [67, p. 247]. Here we should also mention the components of communicative competence by M. Canale and M. Swain. According to them, it consists of linguistic competence (the knowledge of the language code) and sociolinguistic competence (appropriate use of vocabulary, register, style and politeness in a particular context) [68].

Thus, for the analysis in this subsection, communicative competence is viewed as sociolinguistic (or contextual) competence, that is, a set of abilities to successfully carry out professional communication in accordance with the goals and objectives of the language activity and in accordance with the context of the situation. This leads to the introduction of the communicative-competence (or contextual) level into the structure of our analysis [42, p. 70].

When it comes to the criteria for assessing the competence of a politician's linguistic identity, the elite speech culture linguistic identity should be mentioned [31].

T. Kochetkova argues that an elite linguistic identity is characterized by the following criteria: knowledge of literary and linguistic norms; an expanded and in-depth understanding of speech consistency and normativity at the speech and stylistic level; awareness of the fundamental principles of language use, adopted in

modern society, and possible deviations from them; observance of the status norms of communication, adopted in the linguistic culture of the individual and society.

Consequently, the representative of the elite speech culture is characterized by: a combination of elements of speech of different styles, adequate to the goals and objectives of communication; the correct choice of the form of speech, depending on the communicative goals; compliance with existing ethical standards, full respect for the addressee.

It is important to emphasize that the linguistic identity of the bearer of the elite speech culture in any communicative situation demonstrates the art of using the language, with all the variety of its possibilities and with the strict appropriateness of this use [31].

Thus, we start the analysis of Boris Johnson's political speeches with the communicative competence level, bearing in mind the traits of the elite linguistic identity competence.

It should be added that when analyzing communicative competence, we will focus on contextual competence, taking into account the fact that Boris Johnson is often criticized for inappropriate utterances or choice of words.

In the analysis we used the speeches from the time period of 2008-85 that constitute a corpus of 35,000 words. It should be mentioned that the material analyzed in this section consists of official speeches only that were delivered by Boris Johnson from the positions of Mayor of London, Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister, so the speeches belong to the formal talk.

Having analysed the corpus, one can come to a conclusion that Prime Minister Johnson's way of using language is typical for a representative of his profession and a member of high society and both shows his elite education and privileged upbringing. In his speeches, Boris Johnson complies with the rules of

the formal talk: he uses mostly high-register or neutral vocabulary, along with some political vocabulary and clichés:

*Even in the early weeks of the pandemic, I hope that we in the UK resisted the temptations of a **sauve qui peut** approach. [85]*

*I'm very glad to be going back there in just a few days' time with today's **communiqué** in my hand to continue to champion the things we've agreed today. [80]*

*Of course, the **UK's commitment to peacekeeping** does not begin or end with this **Ministerial**. [80]*

*We must support peacekeepers in the field with all of our tools, **from sanctions to embargoes and diplomacy**. [80]*

*...and at the same time not just toughening **the sanctions regime** but **enforcing** those already in place [79]*

Yet in this subsection, we focus on the deviations from some generally accepted norms of formal talk to confirm or refute the public and media opinion that Boris Johnson overuses low-register words and that his word choice is not always appropriate to the situation.

First, we identified some informal words, which are not compatible with formal talk. Below are some specific examples of Boris Johnson's use of informal vocabulary.

*Now paid – entirely voluntarily – by about 250 of **the swankiest** banks, law and accountancy firms in London. [88]*

In this utterance, the colloquial word “swanky” is used to show the excitement caused by the achievement of receiving investments from high-profile companies.

Another example is when Boris Johnson calls himself a “*bus nut*” explaining his strong desire to increase the number of buses in the transport system.

*But it is not just because I am a **bus nut** that we want to expand bus transport. [78]*

Similarly, instead of the words “*self-confidence*” or “*audacity*”, Boris Johnson chooses to use the informal word “*chutzpah*”, apparently, to show his strong emotions toward the subject.

*I believe that talent and genius and initiative and **chutzpah** are evenly distributed across the whole UK. [78]*

*...every corner of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland **the awesome foursome** that are incarnated in that red white and blue flag [75]*

Here Johnson does not call the four nations “*the United Kingdom*” but uses the rhyme which creates a comedic effect, inappropriate for the topic discussed by him in the speech: the serious threat of a no deal-Brexit.

Boris Johnson also uses informal vocabulary to give negative evaluation to some events, people and things. For instance, when saying that many young people in the UK receive the unemployment benefit, he uses the informal phrase “*on the dole*”:

*And with so many school leavers failing to find a job we are seeing a tragic waste of talent 54,000 18-24 year olds **on the dole**. [88]*

Similarly, instead of the neutral term “*human capital flight*” Johnson uses the phrase “*brain drain*”, apparently, to make the utterance more emotional and graphic:

*They have forgotten that the problem used to be **the brain drain**, not people wanting to hear. [81]*

Boris Johnson also uses informal vocabulary trying to discredit his political rival or to make his negative emotions towards them explicit (e.g. when he called his opponent Ed Miliband “*cocky*”, when talking about Jeremy Corbyn’s alleged intention to control the taxes Johnson used the colloquial phrasal verb “whack up” or when he repeatedly calls the people with left-wing political views “*lefties*”):

*You showed that we can overcome a Labour lead and win even in places Ed and co are so **cocky** as to think they own. [88]*

*If Jeremy Corbyn were allowed into Downing Street, he would **whack up** your taxes.[78]*

*And whose response to the grisly events in Venezuela is to side with the regime – simply because they are fellow **lefties**. [81]*

Another instance of Boris Johnson’s use of colloquial vocabulary to give a negative evaluation is when he calls the terrorists in Africa “*numbskulls*”, which can be viewed as undiplomatic.

*Just in the last few weeks, I have seen British troops training the Nigerian forces to defeat **the numbskulls** of Boko Haram around Maiduguri. [81]*

The next type of vocabulary analysed in this subsection is the words coined by Boris Johnson. The most vivid example is “*Brexchosis*”:

*And in the current bout of **Brexchosis** we are missing the truth. [82]*

Apparently, it was created by combining the words “*Brexit*” and “*psychosis*” to give a name to a process of talking a lot (usually in a negative way) about Brexit. The parallel with the psychological illness gives the word a negative connotation, so Boris Johnson uses it to condemn the people who publicly disagree with Brexit.

*I know he has an innocent and **voletrouserred** air but his domestic policies would rack up unfair debts for our children and grandchildren. [81]*

The logic behind this word is unclear, but it can be said that it is meant as an insult of his opponent.

*The doubters, **the doomsters, the gloomsters** – they are going to get it wrong again. [2019]*

Here Johnson coins the word “*gloomsters*” to rhyme with the previous word and create a comedic effect to ridicule people who doubted him and his policies.

In the course of our analysis some deviations from the norms of politeness were identified. There are examples of Johnson using informal ways to refer to his political rivals intending to show his negative emotions towards them (e.g. when he calls Ed Miliband and his team “*Ed and co*” or refer to Jeremy Corbyn as “*that poor fellow*”):

*You showed that we can overcome a Labour lead and win even in places **Ed and co** are so cocky as to think they own. [88]*

*...he wants an election now – or that is what he was going to say, **that poor fellow** [78]*

Boris Johnson also uses informal addresses to sound more friendly and to reduce the emotional distance between him and the people he talks about or addresses:

*We have a great team and we are getting on with the job and yet frankly, **folks**, I don't think I have ever known so many to be sunk in gloom and dubitation about Britain and the world. [81]*

***Kenny old chum** there is no coming back from **that one**. [88]*

*And that is because people can remember **the Stones and Bowie and Led Zep**, monuments of global culture. [81]*

Yet there are instances where Johnson demonstrates the lack of tact for no apparent reasons. For example, he does not mention Theresa May by name in his

first speech as a new Prime Minister calling her his “*predecessor*” throughout the speech.

*I have just been to see Her Majesty the Queen who has invited me to form a government and I have accepted I pay tribute to the fortitude and patience of **my predecessor** and her deep sense of public service. [75]*

Later that year he delivers another speech mentioning the former Prime Minister only by her first name, but in the next sentence calling her husband by both his first and last name.

*And speaking of service, I should begin by paying tribute to **my predecessor Theresa**. I know the whole of conference remains full of gratitude to you, and to **Philip May** [78]*

Another example is when he called the finance minister Sajid Javid “*Saj*”:

*I am going to follow the example of my friend **Saj**.*

Given the minuscule frequency of these instances, we can attribute his lack of politeness to oversight.

## 2.2 Cognitive level

The analysis of the cognitive level of a linguistic identity pursues the goal of reconstructing the person's picture of the world. This level can be characterized by means of ideas, images, schemes, gestalts, frames and other ways of representing knowledge [27, pp. 189-207]. However, in our study, we identify the key concepts that belong to the thesaurus of Boris Johnson.

In our analysis, we proceed from the fact that a person conceptualizes the world in their own way. This conceptualization is the idea of the world, or the conceptual picture of the world [49, p. 36]. According to V. Maslova, the world outlook of a speaker is formed from the totality of concepts (or conceptual sphere) [40, p. 34].

According to Z. Popova and I. Sternin, the concept can be verbalized in various ways (lexical, phraseological, syntactic, etc.). Linguistic detailing of the representation of the concept is achieved through the methods of synonymy, definition, metaphorization, which reveal the conceptual, figurative and evaluative components of the concept [50, pp. 7-8].

As it was mentioned above, the national, group and personal spheres of the linguistic identity coexist and interact in the subject of political communication. In this study, the personal conceptual sphere of a political leader as a linguistic identity is of particular interest, since against the background of nationally and professionally significant representations of concepts, their individual author's hierarchization is clearly visible.

In our study, we focused on linguistic representations of concepts that were outlined at the lexical level mainly through synonymy. The concepts for analysis were selected according to the number of linguistic representations in the analyzed speeches.

The conceptual sphere can be described as a field structure that has a nucleus, a nucleus zone and a periphery [5: 35]. If we proceed from the assumption that there are national and individual concepts, then the periphery will reflect individual concepts, while the nucleus zone and the nucleus itself will be national and even universal. Our research has shown that the nucleus of Boris Johnson's conceptual sphere is made up of such universal concepts for political discourse as "democracy", "power", "domination", "leadership", "people", etc., being the most frequent and representative.

This is quite understandable, since such concepts are among the universals in the world of politics. However, according to researchers, in particular A. Vezhbitskaya, such concepts do not reflect the peculiarities of culture and individuality of a person and the actualization of such concepts contains discursively significant, but not nationally and individually specific features [7]. Here we should recall the concept of an elite linguistic identity mentioned above, because despite the variability of social institutions, researchers note the commonality of basic concepts for all types of elites, which are such concepts as "power", "dominance", "leadership", "success" and other similar concepts [47, p. 182].

Thus, we will focus not so much on the universals of Boris Johnson's conceptual sphere, but on the concepts in which the individuality of his linguistic identity is manifested.

In this study, we analyzed the binary concepts of the subjects of the British political system "the Conservative party" / "the Labor party" as components of the semantic opposition "us vs them", presented in political communication as one of the main conceptual antinomies.

The method of continuous sampling was used to select individual words, phrases as well as the semantically and contextually related words in which these two concepts are verbalized. The concept of "the Conservative Party" is verbalized

mainly in the following words and phrases: *the Tories, Tory Party, the Conservatives, the conservative government, the right wing*; and the concept of “the Labor party” is expressed in the following way: *Labor, the Labor government, the opposition, the left wing, lefties, rivals, enemies*.

In the analyzed texts, the conceptual opposition “the Conservative party” / “the Labor party” organizes the space of political discourse, defining the main vectors of communication, its content and thematic structure, and is also reflected in interdependent associative connections and in regular joint occurrence in general contexts.

In the speeches, the conceptual opposition “the Conservative Party” / “the Labor party” is characterized by a regular co-occurrence, because these binary concepts are often used by Boris Johnson in pairs, which is explained by Johnson’s desire to compare his party with the opposition with the aim of creating a positive image of the Conservative party and a negative image of the Labor party. Here are some examples:

*That’s the difference between this **Conservative party** and the **Labour party**. We want a country with a government that works for everyone. Corbyn wants a Britain where everyone works for the government. [81]*

*We **Conservatives** are well aware that in a society where the gap between rich and poor has been growing – as it did under **Labour** – that we have to look first to the poorest and the neediest. [88]*

The means of negative positioning of the Labor Party in Johnson's speeches are personal and possessive pronouns *they, them, those*, which function as distancing and contribute to the formation of the image of “*them*”, often in a negative way:

***They** have forgotten that we had to fight and win battles of ideas. [81]*

*I have a simple message for **those** on the left, who think everything can be funded by uncle sugar the taxpayer. [84]*

As for the concept “the Conservative party”, its most frequent verbalization is with the pronouns “*we*” or “*us*”, which reinforces the opposition “*us vs them*” and portrays Boris Johnson as an ardent conservative proud of his party membership:

*Thank you first for all you did to make sure that **we Conservatives** won in London this year and thanks to that intrepid expeditionary force of volunteers from around the country. [88]*

*With our long-term fixed rate mortgages we want to spread that opportunity to every part of the country; and that is the difference between **us Conservatives** and the Labour opposition. [2020]*

The analysis of the cognitive level of Boris Johnson’s linguistic identity showed that the concept of “Brexit” is also significant in his language picture of the world.

Brexit is the name of the UK's exit campaign from the European Union. Johnson is one of those people who believe that Brexit is a chance to give the country a better future, to make it stronger, more independent and more confident. The UK will be able to independently control its borders and thereby reduce the flow of migrants and protect the country from terrorism, accepting only those who will help the country develop in scientific and educational fields; and these are not all the opportunities that Brexit can open up. Therefore, for a more specific study of this concept, we will consider the metaphorical model “Brexit is an opportunity”, implemented by Boris Johnson in the analyzed speeches .

The main constituents of the semantic field of a given concept and the lexemes that help define this context as an example of “possibilities” are: *chance, fight, future, horizons, inspire, opportunities, opportunity, reestablish, restore,*

*save, stability, success, successful.* Moreover, this metaphorical model is most often realized through direct definitions, for example:

***Brexit is an opportunity in itself.*** [78]

***Brexit is not a plague of boils or a murrain on our cattle, but an opportunity, and above all an economic opportunity.*** [82]

***... a post-Brexit future is the time of opportunities that are upon us.*** [75]

Thus, Johnson openly and directly broadcasts the idea that he sees some opportunities for his country in leaving the European Union, which can only be realized if Great Britain becomes autonomous.

The lexical representations of the concept of “Brexit” along with those listed above are such lexemes as “*change*”, “*reform*”, “*difference*”, “*renewal*” and “*transformation*”, linking this concept with the concept of “change”. This concept can convey both positive and negative characteristics. It is known that in the system of values of the Conservatives, change is usually associated with instability and deterioration of the situation in the country. However, in his speeches, Boris Johnson combines the concept of “change” with the concept of “Brexit”, giving the audience the impression of Brexit as “change for the better”, pointing out the positive nature of the changes, emphasizing the positive axiological component of the analyzed concept, for example:

***The time has come to get it [Brexit] done and to change this country for the better.*** [75]

Such a change in the semantics of a lexeme, its contextually conditioned axiological signification is caused by the inclusion of “*change*” in the chain of lexemes “*future, success, new, progressive, opportunity*” in the semantics of which there is an unambiguously expressed positive assessment.

The next is the concept of “social responsibility”, which is a key concept in the policy of the Conservative Party; this is explained by the traditions of the Conservative Party. The concept of “social responsibility” is developed in the speeches of Boris Johnson mainly through the means of the deontic modality of obligation:

*“Now we have a new mandate and so we **must** deliver again.” [80]*

*“...we **have to** look first to the poorest and the neediest and those who cannot easily compete.” [88]*

*“In future we **should** aim to telescope that even more: by drawing together our resources, we **should** seek to develop vaccines against emerging diseases in 100 days.” [85 2]*

This concept emphasizes that the British political leader has not only rights, but also obligations. We believe that the dichotomy “us vs them” in combination with positive self-positioning and the ideological concept of “social responsibility” contribute to the formation of the image of the Conservative Party, i.e. the image of the “new conservatives,” a “party for all,” supporting not only the upper class, but the entire population of the country. The key to the implementation of this concept is the lexeme “accountability” token, which is often used by Boris Johnson to verbalize this concept:

*“We talk today ... about instilling a culture of **accountability** for performance ... above all **accountability** to the people.”. [80]*

In the context of crisis communication in Boris Johnson’s discourse, one of the central ideological imperatives is to mobilize forces and unite efforts to overcome economic, financial and other difficulties, therefore, the concept of “unity” plays an important role in the conceptual sphere of Boris Johnson.

The concept of “unity” is mainly used with the noun “*society*” (or “*people*”). Having considered the features of the functioning of the concept

“unity”, we can conclude that it is implemented by the lexemes “*unity*”, “*team*”, “*alliance*”, “*wholeness*”, “*whole*”, “*together*”, “*unite*”. The concept of “unity” is positively marked in Johnson’s speeches, it is the value, the goal and the condition of his policies. A detailed examination of the compatibility of the lexical manifestations of this concept showed that it is often combined with verbs that denote an aspiration or goal (e.g. “*come together*”, “*bring together*”). Thus, Boris Johnson speaks of unity not as a fait accompli, but as a goal; so, it can be concluded that Johnson’s efforts are aimed at uniting British society. It is worth noting that the concept of “unity” often overlaps with the concept of “Brexit”. This is due to the fragmentation of British society in connection with Brexit and Boris Johnson’s desire to end the controversy over Britain’s exit from the EU.

“Friendship” is also an active concept in Boris Johnson's speeches. This concept is one of the main concepts of modern society, as it is one of the most important values in human life.

Friendship is usually understood as a kind of connection or relationship between friends, but in our case this concept is involved in the description of political partnership, this proves the lexical combinations of lexemes that verbalize this concept. For example, combinations like “*our American friends*”, “*our friends in the EU commission*”, “*our Italian friends*”, “*our European friends*”, “*our friends in Ireland, and in Brussels*”, “*our friendship with our closest neighbours*” occur in the speeches very often.

In these combinations, Johnson talks about partnership, but he rarely uses the word “*partner*”, using the word “*friend*” instead, which adds emotionality to the description of a partnership. This could signal that Johnson places great emphasis on partnerships with other countries and wants to demonstrate his interest in the partnership and his friendly attitude.

In addition, the concept of “friendship” is used by Boris Johnson in the meaning of personal relationships. He often talks about his friendships with certain

government officials and famous people, for example, with the former Home Secretary and Chancellor of the Exchequer Sajid Javid, with the famous British politician and former Mayor of London Ken Livingstone, or with the American politician and former Mayor of New York Michael Bloomberg:

*“I am going to follow the example of **my friend Saj.**” [78]*

*“And yes, Ken Livingstone. **Ken, my old chum...**” [88]*

*“And it is no disrespect to **my old friend Mike Bloomberg** to say you are four times more likely to be murdered in New York as you are in London.” [88]*

This is likely due to Johnson’s desire to create an image of an authoritative leader with connections in the highest circles of society. So, the realization of the concept of “friendship” demonstrates the importance of the bonds between person and person, as well as states and nations for Boris Johnson.

### 2.3 Pragmatic (motivational) level

The struggle for power in politics led to the development of a number of communicative strategies, the use of which in political communication determines the effectiveness of the rhetoric of politicians and contributes to the cultivation of a certain image in the mind of the recipient.

Analysis of the pragmatic (motivational) level of the linguistic identity of the current British Prime Minister Boris Johnson based on the material of his speeches suggests that he uses various communicative strategies and tactics (both universal and special) in order to reach his goals.

It should be noted that communicative strategies are implemented using the stylistic means of the language of a separate linguistic identity, since their presence and manipulative influence on consciousness are almost imperceptible for the recipient. Within the framework of a political text, their use pursues certain goals, most often it is to make speech persuasive, imaginative and motivating.

As for strategies and tactics, the first thing worth noting is the confrontation strategy often used by Boris Johnson. Johnson's rhetoric is designed to generate resentment and anger towards his opponents, which are usually the Labor Party and Brexit opponents. This strategy is implemented using negative evaluation of the opponents: e.g. *"those critics are wrong"*, *"they are going to get it wrong again"*, *"the people who bet against Britain are going to lose their shirts"*. Overall, Boris Johnson mostly uses slight or indirect confrontation. However this strategy may include some distortion of facts. For example, the distortion of Labor Party politics when Boris Johnson uses a metaphorical comparison of Labor to *"fratricidal antisemitic Marxists"*. The strategy of discrediting is also quite often used by Johnson. For example, an inherently ironic assumption discredits the UK Labor Party:

*"We lead the world in ... cybernetics – and what is Labour's first instinct on hearing the news? Tax robots! and then make them join the union." [2017 1]*

Johnson often uses opposition tactics as part of his discrediting strategy. The politician tries to portray Jeremy Corbyn and the British Labor Party as incompetent, which is achieved through the constant opposition of Conservatives and Labor, for example:

*“Because for the last hundred years it has been the historic function of Conservatives to be the household implements after the Labour binge has got out of control.” [2012 1]*

In this tactic, Boris Johnson also uses words with negative connotations to describe the opposing party (e.g. *wrong, gloom, indecisive, incapable, pessimists*, etc.) in an attempt to discredit his opponents; to describe his actions and policies, Johnson uses lexical units with a positive meaning (*success, support, exciting, strength, honor, trust*, etc.).

Despite all this, Boris Johnsons also uses the cooperative strategy. This strategy is closely connected with the verbalization of the concepts of “unity” and “friendship” discussed in the previous section. For example, Johnson tries to show his intention to cooperate and avoid conflicts by using the lexis with positive evaluative meaning (e.g. *to work together, friends, opportunity, productive, vital, possibility, to cooperate*, etc.); for this purpose he also uses the deictic marker “our” a lot (e.g. *our friend from the EU, our European friends, our Remainer friends, our friends in Ireland, our Italian friends, our friends in Brussels*, etc.).

The argumentation strategy is worth mentioning regarding the realization of the concept of “Brexit” mentioned in the previous section. Using this strategy, Johnson appeals to the universal values like democracy, unity, equality, freedom, etc. to make people trust him. It should be mentioned that Johnson often incorporates Brexit into this chain of values; exit from the EU and British autonomy are often portrayed by him as democratic values of the British people.

The calling to act strategy should also be mentioned among the strategies frequently used by Boris Johnson. This strategy is often implemented through the

frequent use of the constructions with “*let’s...*” and “*(it is) time to ...*”. These appeals to act immediately grasp the attention of the audience and transmit the idea of the urgency of action:

*“Let’s unite about what we all believe in – an outward-looking liberal global future.” [2018]*

*“It is time to be bold, and to seize the opportunities and there is no country better placed than Britain.” [2017 1]*

When speaking about the constructions with “*let’s*”, they are addressed to the first person plural (“*we*”), which appeals to act on the inner level creating the impression of solidarity. The appeal to act strategy in Boris Johnson’s speeches is usually closely connected to the concept of “change”. Using the vocabulary with positive connotation (e.g. *to improve, to succeed, to make better, to benefit, to promote, amazing, extraordinary, development, benefits, welfare, etc.*) Johnson shows the positive side of the potential changes urging the audience to take some decisive actions.

Along with the argumentation and appealing to act strategies Boris Johnson uses the strategy of manipulation. To manipulate the audience Johnson uses deictic field layering. The layers include “I-speaker” (Boris Johnson as a Prime Minister and as a regular person), “we-speaker” (Boris Johnson and his team, Boris Johnson and his nation and Boris Johnson and the others in the process of Brexit). For instance:

*I am today building a great team of men and women. I will take personal responsibility for the change I want to see. [2019 1] (Boris Jonson as a Prime Minister)*

*“...when I caught it (COVID-19) I had a very common underlying condition. My friends, I was too fat.” [2020] (Boris Johnson as a regular person)*

*“We in this government will work flat out to give this country the leadership it deserves and that work begins now.”* [2019 2] (Boris Johnson and his team)

*“...here in Britain that we are leading the world in the battery technology that will help cut CO2”* [2019 1] (Boris Johnson and his nation)

*“We want to exercise control; and if we are going to move from a low-wage to a high-wage, then Brexit gives us back at least one of the levers we need.”* [2018] (Boris Johnson and the others in the process of Brexit)

It is worth noting that when Boris Johnson speaks on his own behalf, using the pronoun “I”, he often accompanies it with evaluative adverbs (e.g. *I have absolutely no doubt; I am profoundly optimistic; I definitely reject*; etc.).

Thus, using these deictic layers Boris Johnson puts on different roles, allowing him to influence the audience from different standpoints. He can be a Prime Minister, but at the same time be an ordinary British citizen or just a regular person, just like everybody else in his audience, trying to overcome the difficulties of Brexit or the pandemic.

It should also be added that the frequent use of the “I / we” theme characterizes Boris Johnson as a politician clearly aware of the needs and requirements of modern British society, torn from within by many years of internal discontent and conflicts. Against the backdrop of nationwide fragmentation and anger, the image of the united Conservative Party of Great Britain under the leadership of the current Prime Minister adds a special flavor to Boris Johnson’s speeches, opaquely hinting at the culprits of the current situation in the country.

As for the pronoun “we”, it is worth adding that by using it, Johnson tries to achieve a sense of inner unity with the audience, to make people include him in their circle, to create the effect of direct communication:

*“Well, my friends, we have no time now to focus on Captain Hindsight and his regiment.”* [2021 1]

It is worth noting that, as part of the strategy of self-presentation, Boris Johnson also resorts to intimidation tactics, from time to time weaving facts from his personal life into his speeches, intimidating the narrative, for example:

*“I have since lost 26 lbs, and you can imagine that in bags of sugar and I am going to continue that diet.”* [2020]

*“...my mother voted leave. And my mother taught me to believe strongly in ... the equal worth of every human being on the planet.”* [2019 3]

Boris Johnson also uses the storytelling strategy in his speeches. All of his speeches have the features of narrative. Most of them have the structure of the narrative: the introduction, the main story and the end. The end of his “stories” (speeches) is usually optimistic. There is always a conflict featuring heroes and enemies. It is usually Boris Johnson and his party who are portrayed as heroes and the opposition is viewed as enemies who need to be defeated (e.g. he and his team vs Labour or Remainers fighting for the democratic values). Heroes are portrayed as having the upper hand or the resources to fight the enemies. There is usually a “happy end” in Johnson’s “stories” which make them resemble fairy tales (e.g. Brexit that will bring the UK independence and prosperity, or vaccine will soon end the pandemic and we will be back to normal). In a way, this strategy may be regarded as a part of the manipulation strategy, because the facts in Johnson’s speeches are changed and combined in a way that they can fit the narrative structure of a fairy tale with its main characters (heroes and enemies), conflict and happy end.

As noted above, the direction of political discourse is primarily realized through stylistic means. Among the stylistic means that are often used by Boris Johnson, vivid images and unexpected metaphors form the speech originality of his linguistic identity. Johnson often uses metaphorical comparisons, usually within the framework of discrediting tactics, making it impossible to take the opposing side seriously, for example:

*“Let’s get on with sensible, moderate one-nation but tax-cutting Tory government and figuratively if not literally let us send Jeremy Corbyn into orbit where he belongs.”* [2019 3]

*“...they are continuing to chew the supermasticated subject of Brexit when what people want ... to be calmly and sensibly done with the subject, and to move on.”* [2019 4]

We also found the widespread use of comic metaphors. We can call metaphor the most productive stylistic device in Boris Johnson’s speeches, which has the biggest pragmatic potential, for example:

*“... If parliament were a laptop, the screen would be showing the pizza wheel of doom.”* [2019 3]

*“And I was pleased to see the other day that you have called me a blond haired mop. A mop. Well if I am a mop then you are a broom. A broom that is cleaning up the mess left by the Labour government.”* [2012 1]

*“They are the cleanest greenest new bus in Europe. They have conductors and unlike the hopeless broken-backed diplodocus of a bendy bus which was made in Germany, they are made in the United Kingdom.”* [2017 1]

Boris Johnson’s speeches contain a number of humorous remarks and statements that contribute to the comedic effect. They allow you to make the atmosphere less formal, bring the audience closer to the speaker and defuse the tension. The sudden transition from formal political speech to everyday speech enhances the comic effect of the utterance:

*“London, a wonderful city, where by the way it is not raining 94 per cent of the time, and where at one stage – when I was Mayor of London – we discovered that we had more Michelin starred restaurants even than Paris. The French somehow rapidly recovered – by a process that I wasn’t quite sure was entirely fair.”* [2019 3].

“...we will be back to normal, and hairdressers will no longer look **as though they are handling radioactive isotopes**, and... we will no longer have to greet each other by touching elbows as in **some giant national version of the Birdie dance.**” [2020]

Boris Johnson repeatedly uses allusion, using the fact of virtual or actual reality known to the addressee usually in the explicit form. Johnson often makes allusions to myths. For example, by mentioning Prometheus, the British Prime Minister transfers a well-known myth to the current state of affairs, comparing it to the prolonged process of Brexit:

*“When Prometheus brought fire to mankind ... Zeus punished him by chaining him to a tartarean crag while his liver was pecked out by an eagle... And this went on for ever - a bit like the experience of Brexit in the UK.”* [2019 3]

Boris Johnson also makes allusions to literary works and elements of mass culture (famous films, shows, elements of pop culture). For example, Boris Johnson asks the question about the future of mankind based on J. Orwell’s famous dystopia “1984”:

*“At stake is whether we bequeath **an Orwellian world**, designed for censorship, repression and control...”* [2019 3]

When talking about the threat of nuclear war, Johnson draws a parallel between the situation in the world and the scene of the massacre from the famous film:

*“... the world was turned into a nuclear version of the final scene of **Reservoir Dogs.**”* [2017 2]

He also compares the British Parliament to popular survival shows and describes Iranian citizens using the elements of popular culture:

*“If parliament were **a reality TV show** the whole lot of us would have been **voted out of the jungle** by now. But at least we could have watched the speaker being forced to eat a kangaroo testicle.” [2019 3]*

*“... it is profoundly in the interests of the Iranian people. ... **They watch Youtube; they dance to music videos**, even if it is in the privacy of their own home.” [2017 2]*

Thus, allusions to well-known plots and elements of culture allow the politician to evoke the necessary associations and the expected assessment of the events presented in the speeches.

Boris Johnsons also uses a lot of anaphoric parallel constructions, which serve different purposes. Anaphoric repetition creates the image of a strong, decisive leader, ready to solve problems and take responsibility. Through parallel constructions Boris Johnson positions himself as an active and ready to act politician, for instance:

*“We will sort out our aviation capacity problem. We will create new river crossings. We will regenerate East London and we will put in air conditioned and driverless trains. ... We will continue to expand cycle hire and plant thousands of trees. We have the right time zone, the right language and we have the right government in Westminster and I will fight to keep it there.” [2012 2]*

In Boris Johnson’s speeches we can also see many polysyndetons, which along with comedic metaphors may be regarded as the signature feature of his style:

*And wherever you find enterprise **and** initiative **and** start-ups **and** innovation **and** economic growth it is where people have followed ideas that were pioneered by our party. [2017 1]*

Polysyndeton is used to make the tempo of speech slower to draw the listener’s attention to the information enumerated using this stylistic device.

Yet it is important to mention that Boris Johnson also uses asyndeton to make the tempo of his speech quicker. Johnson may combine polysyndetons and asyndetons in close proximity, which creates sudden tempo changes. Sudden changes in tempo may surprise the audience, making the message transmitted in such a way more striking and memorable:

*“...political personality is admired ... for our inventiveness, for our humour, for our universities, our scientists, our armed forces, our diplomacy for the equalities on which we insist – whether race or gender or LGBT or the right of every girl in the world to 12 years of quality education and for the values we stand for around the world ...” [2019 4]*

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2

For the analysis in this chapter, Karaulov's tree-level structure of analysis was slightly changed. Communicative competence level was introduced instead of verbal-semantic one. On this level Boris Johnson's wordchoice in terms of appropriateness was analysed.

Having analysed the speeches on the communicative competence level, we can state that Boris Johnson uses informal lexis which doesn't always fit the context (e.g. phrases with comedic effect used in serious contexts where jokes are inappropriate). Yet despite this fact and the popular opinion that Boris Johnson is lacking in tact, we found few instances of him using low-register lexis (73 words, which is only 0,2 per cent of the total word count) and even fewer examples of him breaking the norms of politeness.

Overall, his choice of words is typical for a person of his profession and a well-educated intelligent man. Boris Johnson usually follows the norms of the formal talk using high-register and neutral vocabulary, alongside with political vocabulary.

On the cognitive level the individuality of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity in the analysed speeches is expressed in such concepts as "the Conservative party" vs "the Labor party", "Brexit", "change", "social responsibility", "unity" and "friendship". This conceptual sphere characterized Johnson as a true and devoted Conservative, proud to be a member of this party, who, unlike many other Conservatives, is not afraid of change and who wants to unite the fragmented British society torn by many things, but most of all Brexit.

The analysis of the pragmatic level of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity allows us to conclude that the main set of goals of his discourse is realized by him primarily through the use of the following strategies: confrontation, cooperation, argumentation, manipulation, storytelling and self-presentation.

As part of these strategies, the politician uses a variety of techniques that affect the audience. Among the most frequent stylistic means in Boris Johnson's political rhetoric are such expressive devices as metaphor, allusion, means of creating a comic effect, as well as polysyndeton, asyndeton, anaphora and parallel constructions. All of them allow Boris Johnson to express his own attitude to the particular phenomenon, increase the persuasiveness and reliability of the judgments and assessments given; they are aimed at grasping the attention of the audience and focusing it on important points, they make the performance more lively and enhance the pragmatic effect of the statement.

## CHAPTER 3. FEATURES OF BORIS JOHNSON'S LINGUISTIC IDENTITY IN WRITTEN DISCOURSE

### 3.1 Verbal-semantic level

We should start the analysis of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity as a writer by mentioning the fact that he used to earn his living by writing. Johnson wrote half a dozen books and countless newspaper articles.

His books include six non-fiction books, a fiction book and a book for children in verse. For our analysis we selected the initial and final chapters of four non-fiction books written by Johnson (The Churchill Factor, Have I Got Views for You, Johnson's Life of London and Life in the Fast Lane) so as to create a corpus that in terms of the total word count equals the corpus used in the previous Chapter to ensure the compatibility of the results.

The subject of our research in this section is the analysis of the verbal-semantic level of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson manifested in his books. The words functioning in the analyzed corpus of Johnson's written speech were classified into thematic groups. The largest of them will be given here.

The verbal-semantic level of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity is characterized primarily by a large amount of lexis of a political nature: *party, embassy, negotiations, election campaign, electoral college, foreign affairs, debates, conservative, liberal, right-wing, left-wing, opposition, communique, etc.* Among the words of this thematic group there is a wide use of lexemes denoting ranks and posts: *government official, MP, minister, spokesperson, PM, party leader, parliamentary leader, Secretary, ambassador, etc.* The abundance of general political vocabulary is explained by the fact that Boris Johnson wants to position himself as a politician first.

The thematic group "professional activity" is also numerous: *to appoint as, to order, boss, manager, to take up the post, to get a position, to run, to manage, to*

*get promoted, report, to take office, a candidate for a job, working hours, employees, colleagues, hired, pay rise, job opening, etc.* This vocabulary characterizes Boris Johnson as a careerist politician and journalist.

Proper names are also large in number. Within this lexical group a subgroup of anthroponyms can be distinguished. Johnson mentions people's names very often, regardless of the subject he is talking about; those are the people from different spheres and walks of life: *Tony Blair, Peter Stothard, Alec Russel, Tim Butcher, David Beckham, Professor Miranda Aldhouse-Green, Stephen Byers, Lord Halifax, M. Paul Reynaud, Brockie, Sergeant Major A. Brook, Alan Browne, Sir Anthony Montague Bruce, Allan Bryan, William Jennings, Mo Farah, Charles de Gaulle, General Strike, Sir Anthony Montague Browne*, and many more.

A group of toponyms and words associated with a specific geographic object are also very frequent in Boris Johnson's books, to name a few: *Baghdad, Iraq, Portland, Oregon, Kosovo, Uzbekistan, Cuba, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Sarajevo, Liverpool, Oxfordshire, Italy, Greece, Russia, Mogadishu, Djibouti, Felixstowe, Rotterdam, Czechoslovakia, Bora Bora, Israel, Bolivia, New York, Spain, Ibiza, Thailand, Himalayas, Cyprus, Bahamas, Tokyo, Brussels, Nigeria, New Zealand, Venice, etc.*

It is worth noting that in the fragments analyzed, most of the proper names are mentioned by Johnson in connection with his personal biography. This fact testifies to the author's desire to create an impression of himself as an experienced and knowledgeable person who has seen the world, demonstrating his life full of impressions and people, sometimes in a way that reveals some negative character traits like narcissism and self-praise.

Boris Johnson received an excellent education and was actively engaged in self-education. This circumstance is reflected in the language of his books. As it was repeatedly mentioned, Boris Johnson can be considered an elite linguistic identity, whose characteristic is, on the one hand, using the lexical elements

understandable to the inner circle of the same elite group (for example, expressions and terms in Latin or other languages, etc.). On the other hand, the discourse of the elite is characterized by the adaptation of the discourse to the social level of the addressee of the message.

Nevertheless, despite Johnson's tendency to democratize the language, his books reflect the vocabulary characteristic of an elite linguistic identity, albeit in relatively small numbers. This is evident in the use of phrases in Latin and French, for example: *e pluribus unum*, *entrepôt*, *de jure*, *ad hoc*, *joie de vivre*, *vox populi*, *folie de grandeur*, *prima facie*, *ante partum*, etc.

A distinctive feature of Boris Johnson's writing is that it resembles a memoir or a personal diary. In this regard, Johnson widely uses words denoting the sensory sphere (e.g. anger, grief, trust, passion, joy, fear, etc.) The core of the verbal-semantic level of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson is the evaluative vocabulary. There are a lot of words containing a positive or negative assessment in his writing. The use of such vocabulary results from the character traits of Johnson himself, his emotionality, as well as the fact that the books were written, among other things, to describe his own life and assess the events, situations and people surrounding the author. A group of words with a distinct positive assessment is represented by such lexemes as: *cheerful*, *delight*, *awesome*, *cool*, *marvelous*, *gratitude*, *rejoice*, *passionately*, *love*, *happiness*, *pleasure*, etc.

Interesting is a group of words associated with the description of a person (e.g. *not so bad*, *very capable*, *middle-aged*, *ugly*, *gorgeous woman*, *nice chum*, *clever*, *eccentric*, *sweet*, *nice person*, *mediocre* and other descriptions of the social status of the person, their emotional and moral characteristics). Here we can see the intention of the author to show his judgment about everyone and everything.

Using the words and phrases with negative semantics, Johnson finds those that most accurately characterize a person or a situation, sometimes they can possess very negative connotation, they can be colloquial or even vulgar, for

example: *dumb, pathetic, stupid, unproductive hack, bastards, namby-pamby, thug, fools*, etc.

Thus, when characterizing or describing someone, Boris Johnson uses the words that simultaneously convey the opinion and emotions that arise in him concerning this or that person, depicting the most striking and distinctive qualities of their character. For example, about his fellow journalist Johnson writes:

*“One of my fellow-trainees, a young thruster in a grey suit, could take no more. He was my age and signed on at the absurd rate of £18,000 p.a. I thought, and I think, that he was a pompous squirt, and I hope that he was an early victim of the management consultancy shake-out that followed.”* [90]

Boris Johnson’s literary work is a vivid example of the democratization of the English language, which is primarily reflected in the fact that colloquial vocabulary constitutes a large layer here. In his writing, Boris Johnson prefers using informal vocabulary wherever possible. Performing quite definite pragmatic functions of attracting the audience and language play, they are often present in Boris Johnson’s writing (e.g. *zing, chum, cool, damn, bloke, cheeky, narky, boffin, gotta, lairy, whacky, yammer*, etc.) A large number of British colloquialisms helps to create the image of Johnson as an ordinary Briton, just like everybody else in his country, for example:

*“Perhaps you clever reader were and moan those who had already sussed out that the country would want to move on from the harsh vocabulary of Thatcherism.”* [76]

*“I was standing in the posh al-Mansour district of Baghdad.”* [90]

*“They may not have hit Saddam, who was allegedly noshing in a nearby chicken and chip joint.”* [89]

### 3.2 Cognitive level

Analysing the cognitive level of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity on the material of his books, we followed the example of the previous chapter and studied the concepts in Johnson's writing to make sure that the results of both parts of the analysis are compatible. So, in this chapter, as in the previous one, we selected the concepts according to the number of linguistic representations, focusing on their linguistic representations. It should be noted that here we focus on the concepts that manifest the individuality of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity in his writing.

It should be noted that even though the books chosen for the analysis are not supposed to be about politics only, what we have here is Boris Johnson in one way or another defining his political identity and beliefs and describing the world through the prism of politics. The prime example is when Johnson describes his career choice, creating seemingly illogical connection between cars and politics:

*"I became a motoring correspondent because I am interested in politics, and it has always seemed obvious to me that the car has not only made our modern landscape, it has been the biggest revolution since print, and the spread of the car, like the spread of literacy, has been a fantastic and unstoppable force for liberty and democracy."* [91]

Thus, analyzing the cognitive level of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity, it is worth starting with a description of the area of political concepts that make up the political conceptual system in Johnson's books. It includes: concepts of political realities (primarily the concept of "power"), concepts of political associations (conceptual opposition "Conservative Party" vs "Labor Party"), the concept of the state associated with the concept of the country's population (concepts of "Britain" and "Britishness").

We will start with the concept of "power" and its implementation in Johnson's writing. It is known that concepts are implemented through a set of

lexical units. When studying this concept, on the basis of component analysis, we identified possible means of linguistic representation of this concept.

The concept of “power” belongs to the category of stable concepts (it has a standard lexical form of verbalization). The meanings inherent in the concept of “power” are represented in the analyzed texts in the following lexemes: *power, powerful, authority, strength, force, might, control, domination, strength, influence, management, ability, efficiency, effectiveness, military force, army.*

The analysis of the verbalization of the concept of “power” in the analyzed texts allows us to highlight the main features of its semantic field. The main meaning is the ability to act or influence something. The next basic element of the field is the meaning of dominance and control over others. The last seme, which is included in the core of this concept, describes a subject endowed with the power of authority (usually the government or government representatives). Thus, the semantic structure of the concept “power” is described using three basic categories.

The content of this concept is determined not only by the lexemes, but also by its close connection with concepts such as “authority” and “money”. The analysis shows that this concept is primarily associated with politics and with institutions that represent power (e.g. parliament). Institutions and representatives of authority simultaneously represent the concepts of “authority” and “power”.

The analysis of the speech realizations of the concept of “power” also shows that power is also associated with wealth (money) for Boris Johnson. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the use of lexical representations of the concept “power” with lexical representations of the concept “money” has a high frequency. This is manifested in such common expressions as “*rich and powerful*”, “*economically powerful*”, “*the power of money*”, “*wealth and power*”, etc. From this we can conclude that, according to Johnson, power is access to material resources (money) in different forms.

In the previous chapter it was mentioned that the opposition “us vs them” is one of the main conceptual antinomies. Both in the speeches and in the books there is a manifestation of this antinomy in the conceptual opposition “Conservative party” vs “Labor party”. The concept “Conservative Party” is verbalized in the words and phrases “*the Conservatives*”, “*the conservative government*”, “*the Tories*”, “*Tory Party*”, “*the right wing*”. The lexical means that verbalize the concept of “*Labor party*” are “*the Labor government*”, “*Labor*”, “*the left wing*”, “*the opposition*”, “*lefties*”, “*(political) rivals*”, “*(political) enemies*”.

In the books, as in the speeches, the conceptual opposition “Conservative party vs Labor party” is characterized by a frequent joint occurrence. The representations of these two concepts are often used by Boris Johnson in close proximity which can be explained by intention to compare these two parties in the way that shows the Conservative Party from the positive side and the Labour Party from the negative perspective. For instance:

*“It is the most ingenious feature of **Labour’s** public sector expansion that they have thereby created a clerisy of officials who depend for their livelihoods on a high-taxing, high-spending politically correct government; and therefore any incoming **Tory** administration must realise that shrinkage of that public sector will necessitate real courage, and will involve real pain.”* [90]

Boris Johnson may even use this conceptual opposition as a lens through which he can describe the things not connected to politics, which shows that these concepts are central in the author’s language picture of the world, for instance:

*“The typical **Tory** voter drove a Ferrari Testarossa, while the typical **Labour** voter drove a car called a Kia.”* [91]

As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, Boris Johnson separates the two concepts frequently using the pronoun “we” describing the Conservative Party, presenting himself as a proud Conservative, and calling the Labor Party

“*they*” to distance himself from the opposing party and usually showing it from the negative perspective:

*“Maybe it was about time **we Tories** started sticking up for Maggie [Margaret Thatcher].” [91]*

*“Would **they** [the Labour Party] have treated with Hitler, as the Foreign Secretary was proposing? It seems overwhelmingly likely.” [76]*

Like the previous two concepts, the concept of “change” was also mentioned in connection with the cognitive analysis of Boris Johnson’s speeches. For Johnson’s books, this concept is also one of the main ones. Not having unambiguously positive or negative characteristics out of context, this concept in the rhetoric of conservatives usually acquires a negative assessment. The Labor Party even gives the concept “change” the status of the main ideological concept in the fight against the conservatives.

Therefore, it is particularly interesting that Boris Johnson verbalizes this concept in a positive way, using words such as “prosperity”, “development”, “opportunities”, “improvement”, “future”, “progress”, “renewal”, etc. Adjectives and synonyms with positive connotation demonstrate a positive assessment of the concept by the author, for example:

**“We saw how this country and much of the world has **changed for the better**, in our lifetimes.” [89]**

**“...none of those **changes and improvements** should be taken for granted... without them there would have been no great **reforming** Labour government, because there would have been no **democracy** to install it. There would have been no **unions**, because they would have been repressed, along with **free speech** and **civil rights**.” [76]**

This shows Boris Johnson as a liberal at heart, who nevertheless does not deviate from the politics of his party and remains a conservative who recognizes

the need for change in the modern world. This is best illustrated by the following example:

*“...all sensible Tories know – that **the only way to keep things the same is to make sure you change them**; or as Burke puts it, a state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.” [76]*

The concepts that do not have equivalents in other linguistic cultures to the greatest extent reflect the peculiarities of mentality, cognitive approach to the world and ways of mastering reality and its moral assessment of the author. If we take Boris Johnson’s conceptual sphere, here we can talk about a concept that can be called “the spirit of Britain” or “Britishness”. Many British leaders turn to the definition of “Britishness”, clarifying the concept itself in the new political conditions and shaping the idea of this concept in the minds of the people. The concept of “Britishness” in its verbally represented forms has traditionally been used by politicians in order to impose certain views on society and retain its power.

The implementation of this concept in Johnson’s writing occurs through opposition to the interpretation of “Britishness” by representatives of the Labor Party, who are convinced that integration into the British society should not supplant traditional cultures. Boris Johnson rejects this view, along with the representation of “Britishness” as “multiculturalism”, accusing this approach to the definition of “Britishness” in creating fragmentation and alienation in the society:

*“It is utterly **absurd** that Labour should be calling on us all to remember the value of that **inclusive word “British”**, when it is the government’s own devolution programme which has fomented the rising sense of **Scottishness, and Englishness**.” [91]*

*“Labour ministers have been groping desperately **symbols of Britishness to create this sense of belonging**. ... but in areas where primary immigration is still taking place on a large scale, there is only **the vaguest sense of belonging**. To what do they belong? The Afro-Caribbean community? The Vietnamese*

community? The answer is often **unclear**, and this has psychological consequences... **the feeling of alienation** will grow stronger.” [90]

For Johnson, the concept of “Britishness” includes the meaning of belonging to the British society, but at the same time it includes the cultural characteristics of the population of Britain, which in many cases refer to the original population of Britain. As the analysis of the material has shown, the concept of “Britishness” is implemented in contextual contact with such units as: “to have a sense of fair play”, “sense of humor”, “to do a good job”, “to have good manners”, “to behave respectfully”, “to adore the countryside”, “to disregard the color of your skin or accent”, “to speak English”, etc. In other words, the concept of “Britishness” is considered by Johnson as a systematizing dominant that defines belonging to the British nation not only as a territorially, politically and economically united group of people, but as a nation united around one common culture, character traits and language. The author points out the fact that although the inhabitants of Great Britain have different origins and have different national and cultural characteristics, they must assimilate and merge with the culture of Britain:

*“This is the sign of a confident urban culture, to take people from all over the world and make them Londoners, in vocabulary, accent, loyalty and even in their sense of humour. That is the spirit of London.”* [89]

*“Labour says he’s black. We say he’s **British**.”* [90]

The concept of “patriotism”, which is part of the conceptualized area of “Britishness”, in a number of cases is a verbal representative of this concept, for instance:

*“**British patriotism** that was shown by people from all races and backgrounds, we saw how the city takes people in and makes them its own.”* [89]

In such a way, Johnson responds to the fragmentation of British society, setting the goal of a united and homogeneous society, which echoes the concept of “unity” discussed in the previous chapter:

*“We had beamed positive images of Britain around the world and filled people with a general sense of togetherness and love-your-neighbour. What else is politics for?” [76]*

The widespread use of axiological concepts by the authors is due to the fact that they are not only a product of thought, but they are also emotionally experienced, possessing the ability to show the spirit of a person. Therefore, these concepts can be classified as cognitive universals.

Among such concepts in the conceptual sphere of Boris Johnson the concept of “success” stands out. This concept is one of the most important in Johnson’s conceptual picture of the world. This concept occupies a high level in the hierarchy of concepts and has a high frequency of verbalization.

Having analyzed the concept of “success” in the books of Boris Johnson, we can conclude that it is verbalized primarily by such lexical units as “*result*”, “*accomplishment*”, “*attainment*”, “*effectiveness*”. The analysis of the contextual meanings that make up the conceptual component of this concept made it possible to single out the central element “work” around which such features as *hard work*, *progress*, *action*, *process* and *achievement* are concentrated.

Here we can talk about the actualization of this concept in the “success - achievement” frame. The components of this frame contain expressions with the nomination of success: “*to make a success*”, “*well-deserved success*”, “*little success*”, etc.; as well as verbs with the semantic component of achievement: “*to achieve*”, “*to succeed*”, “*to attain*”, “*to manage*”, etc. Thus, Boris Johnson sees success, first and foremost, as the results at work (usually professional achievements). It results in the connection of this concept with the concept of “work”; success for Johnson is to produce results, for instance:

*“Churchill was indispensable to **success** ... because he **frantically worked** to equip the forces with the devices.” [76]*

### 3.3 Pragmatic (motivational) level

The analysis of the pragmatic level of the linguistic identity in the texts of Boris Johnson is presented in the form of an analysis of the communicative strategies and tactics most frequently used by the author in his books. Since the books chosen for the analysis are non-fiction and they perform mainly informative function broadcasting Boris Johnson's views and his interpretation of numerous events (e.g. his version of Winston Churchill's biography) together with biographical moments, and due to the fact that it is our goal to make the results of the analyses from both practical chapters compatible, we study the pragmatic level from the perspective of strategies and tactics, following the example outlined in the previous chapter.

Analysis of the material showed that in his books Boris Johnson uses various strategies, but the most frequent and clearly manifested are the strategy of self-presentation, the strategy of rapprochement with the addressee, and the evaluation strategy (which includes strategies of positive and negative evaluation).

The first strategy that catches the eye when reading Boris Johnson's books is the strategy of self-presentation. The objective of this strategy is the creation by the author of such an image of himself in the text, which will inspire confidence in him and thereby will allow the author to impose on the reader some ideas and opinions.

One of the tasks of Johnson's books is to describe the facts and events and the formation of public opinion. However, in the process of obtaining information, the reader not only finds out about the events described, but also sees the reflection of the author's personality in the text. In the analyzed texts, the author is clearly present, describing himself with an explicit "I", for example:

*"In fact our whole future looks so ghastly and stifling that I find myself loosening **my** tie and mopping **my** brow as I write these words... In this sweaty dystopia I foresee a time when you will have to engage in carbon offsetting every time you make a trip to Waitrose." [91]*

The tactic of positive presentation allows the author to present himself as a person with certain professional and personal qualities. The implementation of this intention is characterized by such techniques as professional identification, memories (or an anecdote), confession and self-criticism (or self-irony).

The technique of professional identification is realized through the introduction into the text of information about the author's occupation, his professional competence in a certain area of knowledge. In our case, for example, constructions with the conjunction "as" are frequently used (e.g. "*I, as editor of the Spectator, have access to ...*" [91]; "*My career as a journalist began in ...*" [90]; "*As a politician, I ...*"[76]).

As a result, the reader understands that behind the opinions presented in the book, there is a real person who has certain knowledge, skills, and who specializes in the material that is given. This should enhance the author's status in the eyes of the reader.

However, it is often important for the author to emphasize his human qualities, to present himself as an ordinary person experiencing certain feelings and emotions.

The technique of memories (or anecdote) allows Johnson to convey information about the facts that took place in his life, which means that they demonstrate the utmost openness of the author and the reliability of what is described, which creates an atmosphere of trust. Narration is used here, which connects this technique with the storytelling strategy mentioned in the previous chapter:

*"'Is there any way we can be sure this won't happen during the Games?' I remember asking, and I remember too the thrill of apprehension when I realised that the answer, frankly, was no."* [89]

The purpose of the confession is to demonstrate such a valuable personality trait as sincerity, which raises the author's status in the eyes of the reader. Honesty in communication is not only the observance of one of the maxims, but also the key to establishing a friendly, sincere relationship between the author and the reader. At the linguistic level, "confession" is realized through the corresponding stance markers (e.g. *to be honest, frankly, I must confess, I have to admit*, ec.), for example:

*"When I became a motoring correspondent it wasn't just because I am a speed freak (though I am, **to be honest**). It wasn't just because I wanted an endless series of beautiful machines for the weekend (though that is a factor, **I have to admit**). It was also because, at the risk of being pretentious—and why the hell not, eh?—"* [91]

In order to win over the reader, it is important for the author to create a positive image of himself and demonstrate such personal qualities that the audience will appreciate: sincerity, friendliness, politeness, etc.

For Boris Johnson, the explication of a critical attitude towards himself is a distinctive feature, therefore the technique of self-criticism and self-irony is so important for a complete description of his linguistic identity. Boris Johnson often ironically interprets his own actions, deliberately belittling his own status, for example:

*"Looking back through the articles I wrote, **I can find nothing of any merit whatsoever**. I could not help wondering how long the Times could afford to employ such **a heroically unproductive hack**. In an attempt to step up my output, I started trawling the agency wires."* [90]

With the help of this technique, Johnson attracts the reader, since he does not idealize himself, but creates an image of an ordinary person.

The evaluation (presentation) strategy has the task of creating in the mind of the addressee an image of the described object. The presentation strategy, depending on the evaluation vector, is aimed at creating a positive or negative image.

The author's expression of his impressions contributes to the intimization of communication, making it more sincere. Such openness should make the addressee trust the author and even adopt his point of view.

It should be noted that the strategy of negative presentation occurs in the analyzed fragments much more often than positive. A significant proportion of the negative evaluation in the text is largely due to the fact that negative information and the presence of a conflict make readers interested and attract their attention, which Johnson actively uses.

This strategy is implemented by Johnson primarily through the technique of accusation and mocking (or ridiculing). Boris Johnson can blame someone openly using such stylistic devices as epithets and metaphors:

*“They will all become even more **namby-pamby**, **elf-n-safety-conscious**, **regulation-prone** and generally incapable of beating the Australians.” [90]*

*“Giulio Andreotti ... is **the great bubo of corruption** beneath the skin of Italian politics.” [91]*

The criticism can be implicit, when Johnson does not directly speak about certain flaws of someone or something, but hints at them, usually using such stylistic means as metaphor, irony or allusion:

*“The new Labour Party speaks of 'solidarity, tolerance and respect. The Body Shop offers 'honesty, fairness and respect'.” [89]*

*“Without so much as an apologetic cough, the sat-nav then drives me home by precisely contradicting its earlier instructions, showing that it would have a great career at the top of British politics.” [91]*

*“He was tall, very tall; at 6 foot 5 he loomed about ten inches above Churchill – though I suppose that advantage matters less around a table.” [76]*

*“If Anita Roddick can persuade millions of people to buy her delightful coconut oil shampoo or taramasalata facial scrub, then why should identical techniques not persuade us all to vote Labour?” [90]*

In Johnson’s books, evaluation strategy can occur through opposition tactics. Usually, this is a comparison of the Conservatives and the Labor Party, which is directly related to the implementation of the conceptual opposition “Conservative Party” and “Labor Party” mentioned in the previous section.

Boris Johnson’s strategy of rapprochement with the addressee is primarily expressed in the tactics of dialogue with the reader. The dialogization of the narrative, contributing to the establishment of contact between the author and the reader, is indicated by the presence of the markers indicating address in the texts. Establishing and maintaining interaction with the addressee can be carried out in different forms: the author directly addresses the reader with a question, advice, request, draws their attention to certain significant points, etc. For instance:

*“My friends, this is luxury: all I ask is are we worth it? Do we deserve it, this mollycoddling?” [91]*

*“You think the flush toilet was invented by Thomas Crapper, don’t you? Think again, my friends.” [89]*

Dialogue as a form of communication presupposes the presence of two participants in the speech situation. The book is a monologue in its form, so we can only talk about the illusion of direct communication, the imitation of dialogue. The tactic of dialogue with the reader is implemented through an appeal to the reader.

The appeal to the reader is realized through the following techniques: direct address, question and association.

Addressing the reader occurs through direct address; Johnson's most frequent form of address is "my friends" or "reader":

*"My friends, let us be frank: I am 99 per cent certain that he was there."* [91]

*"Perhaps you, clever reader, even predicted that the apparently happily married young Sloane would one day be transformed into a martyr and icon of sentimental values."* [90]

*"But I can assure you, gentle reader, that this was nothing to do with the problem that overwhelmed me."* [89]

The question technique is implemented through the use of interrogative constructions, usually rhetorical questions. The reader acts as the addressee, the purpose of the question is to attract the reader's attention, appeal to their thoughts and feelings. Addressing the reader in such a way Johnson seeks an ally, who would share his point of view:

*"What is a city but the people?"* [89]

*"How did Herbert Hoover win the 1928 presidential election? With what vision did he inspire and enthuse the American electorate?"* [91]

The technique of associating (uniting) the author with the reader is carried out through the use of the inclusive pronoun "we" and the verbs with imperative semantics of joint action, due to which the reader seems to be involved in the author's thought process:

*"They say he was pale, and pasty, and that seems believable. Let us add a cigar, and some ash on his lap, and a clenched jaw with a spot of drool."* [76]

*“Let’s be honest, folks, and name the big machine after its real target market. Let’s just call it the Mercedes Diktator and be done with it, because we all know that the Merc is the car of choice for the discerning African tyrant.”* [91]

With the help of this technique, the reader gets the impression of joint reflections with the author on the proposed topic.

It is also necessary to look more closely at the stylistic devices used by Boris Johnson in his books, since the pragmatic purpose of the texts manifested in the form of strategies and tactics is realized primarily through the use of literary devices. Among most frequently used ones and common for all the texts in the corpus are epithets, metaphors, similes, and allusions.

Epithets are especially curious since there is one specific trait very frequently used by the author to describe people and things is compound adjectives; often they are compound by Johnson himself (e.g. *“spongebag-trouserred butler”* [76], *“woad-painted, butter-haired, betrousered Saxon savage”*[89], *“banana-booted demigod”* [90], *“red-blooded, Lexus-buying British male”*[lane], *“faded-denim-blue eyes”* [90], *“pudding-basin-haired sons”* [89], *“massage-offering female Rasputin”*[91], etc.) It is remarkable that in most cases epithets are used to give a negative characteristic.

Unexpected and comedic metaphors are also often used by Boris Johnson in his writing. In such a way Johnson demonstrates his wit and tries to attract the reader’s attention urging them to take his side. Boris Johnson frequently uses metaphors to discredit someone, using humour to make it impossible for a reader to take to take them seriously, for example:

Unexpected similes serve a similar purpose. Boris Johnson usually uses comedic comparisons to implement the tactic of negative evaluation and discrediting, for instance:

*“He was dressed in his strange Victorian/Edwardian garb, with his black waistcoat and gold watch chain – like some burly and hungover butler from the set of Downton Abbey.” [76]*

*“At last the Pope appeared from his Alitalia jet, evidently exhausted but still somehow glowing – like a sugared almond – in his white vestments and scarlet slippers.” [89]*

Allusion is another common literary device in Boris Johnson’s books. He uses allusions to various cultural elements: classical literature, painting, films, pop culture, etc. It portrays him as a versatile personality. Allusions to popular culture bring Johnson even closer to the reader and increases the author’s influence on the audience. For instance:

*“The M1, somewhere near Luton, a boiling Saturday. The air con had conked in the vast petrol-powered Toyota zeppelin which is the normal Johnson motor. One child was eating crisps, crunch, crunch, crunch, in my ear... Hieronymus Bosch could not have painted a more harrowing portrait of hell.” [91]*

*“...you are also doing your bit to save the planet, since it produces 90 per cent less CO 2 emissions than other family saloons of comparable size. And yet still, in the words of Galileo, it moves.” [89]*

*“They looked like a master race from outer space, or something from the pages of Judge Dredd.” [76]*

*“I can’t understand how this sober old buzzard was prevailed upon to say that a racist incident might be so defined in the view of the victim or any other person. This is Orwellian stuff.” [90]*

*“Never mind Spiderman. Forget Harry Potter and his struggle against Voldemort. I’ll tell you my hero of the hour. He’s a sixty-eight-year-old Liberal Democrat peer.” [89]*

*“If you have a sudden surge in the number of highly educated women - more women than men - then it is not surprising that you have a fair few **Bridget Jones-type** characters who are having a tough job finding Mr Darcy.” [91]*

### CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3

Having analyzed the verbal-semantic level of Boris Johnson's linguistic identity as a writer, it can be stated that it is represented mainly by political, colloquial and evaluative vocabulary. Johnson's choice of words characterizes him as an avid politician and careerist.

Even though he demonstrates his elite upbringing and education in his wordchoice, a distinctive feature of the author's language is the tendency towards democratization (e.g. the use of British colloquialisms, slang and some occasional vulgar words). Simplicity, ease, emotionality of presentation and variety of vocabulary makes the language of Johnson's books stand out.

Boris Johnson's conceptual sphere manifested in his books consists of the following concepts: "power", "the Conservative party" vs "the Labor party", "Britishness", "change" and "success". It portrays him as a proud Conservative, wanting to unite the fragmented British society, and who, unlike many members of his party, doesn't mind changes and sees success as an achievement through hard work.

The analysis of the linguistic material from a pragmatic point of view showed that in his books Boris Johnson primarily uses strategies of self-presentation, negative assessment and rapprochement with the addressee. These communication strategies are verbalized using various techniques and literary devices, primarily epithets, metaphors, similes and allusions. Comedy is often what Boris Johnson goes for to create a positive image of himself and to establish a platform for influencing people's minds. As an author Johnson exploits different masks. He can be a trustworthy professional, an enthusiastic conversationalist and sometimes even a simpleton. He widely uses the techniques to make the reader laugh to have more influence.

In the reader's mind the combination of these techniques creates an image of Boris Johnson as a chatty, likable character. Yet behind the curious choice of words, humour and self-irony, we can sense a much more calculating behaviour than it may seem at first.

## CONCLUSIONS

The study of a linguistic identity is one of the most relevant areas of modern linguistics due to the predominance of anthropocentrism in modern science. In modern linguistics, various aspects of the analysis of a linguistic personality are distinguished, corresponding to various linguistic disciplines. Among these aspects, the systemic reconstruction of the linguistic identity in accordance with its structure is of particular interest.

It seems that the analysis of the linguistic identity of such an outstanding personality as Boris Johnson will contribute to the improvement of the theory of linguistic identity. The very diverse groups of words used by Johnson: informal vocabulary, as well as words coined by him (usually in the form of unusual epithets) are present both in his political speeches and in literary works. They express the author's intention to appear likable and approachable and help to achieve a more vivid characterization of the described objects and phenomena to attract the attention of the audience. This eccentricity and emotionality manifests itself much more strongly in writing, but speech also reflects this distinctive feature of Johnson's linguistic identity.

Johnson's linguistic picture of the world shows him as an avid conservative politician. The conceptual opposition "Conservative party" versus "Labor party" is of paramount importance, both in oral and written discourse, which indicates the significance of politics in general and certain political views in particular in Johnson's perception of the world. The concept of "change" is also common to the conceptual spheres of Johnson the politician and Johnson the writer. This is due to his liberal views, despite his affiliation with the Conservative party. The concepts of "unity" and "friendship" that we highlighted with regard to the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson as a politician and the concept of "Britishness", which belongs to Johnson's conceptual sphere as a writer, can also be combined into one group. It does not matter whether he is talking about the partnerships with other countries, or about overcoming conflicts in a culturally and politically fragmented

British society, he promotes the idea of cohesion and friendly relationships between people in all spheres of life. Worth mentioning is the Johnson-specific concept of “Brexit”. The verbalization of this concept shows Johnson as an ardent supporter of British autonomy and the country’s reliance on its own forces. The specificity of the verbalization of the concept of “success”, which we have highlighted in Johnson’s written discourse, characterizes him as a professional and careerist.

The results of the analysis of the cognitive level of Boris Johnson’s linguistic identity are directly related to the results of the study of the pragmatic (motivational) level. The centrality of the opposition “Conservative party” vs “Labour party” in his conceptual sphere explains Johnson’s favourite strategy, both in speeches and in writing, of confrontation, expressed mainly through tactics of accusation, discrediting and negative evaluation. Naturally, in public speeches he is less direct but the logic behind using these strategies is the same for Johnson the politician and Johnson the writer. Strategies of self-presentation and rapprochement with the addressee are also very important to Johnson, both in his speeches and in his books. As expected, the strategy of self-presentation is more evident in his books, since they are autobiographical in nature, but the strategy of rapprochement with the addressee is equally strongly expressed in both versions of his linguistic identity. Storytelling strategy is also a favorite technique of Boris Johnson, as it allows, in the form of a story about the struggle between “heroes” and “villains”, to actualize the conceptual opposition “us vs them”, often used by Johnson.

There is also a connection between the motivational and cognitive levels and the verbal-semantic one, which manifests itself, for example, in the words coined or compound by Johnson, for negative evaluation he invents or composes adjectives that make very bright epithots. To get closer to the audience, he deliberately lowers the register of speech. To create a positive image of himself, he can use high-register vocabulary, which indicates his high social status and

intelligence balancing an image of an amateur and simpleton to claim some sort of authority.

Thus, Boris Johnson's goal is to charm his audience with his self-irony and scruffiness. His tone is often humorous and his aim is to make people laugh. His wordchoice, the concept he verbalizes and the strategies he uses both as a politician and a writer create an image of him as a sincere, happy-go-lucky, close to people and friendly with his allies person, which seems to be working on his audience rather well.

Considering that Boris Johnson is primarily a politician whose goal is to gain power and influence over people, such results of the reconstruction of his linguistic identity is quite understandable. The material is so rich that it is possible to outline further prospects for the study of the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson. We believe that it is possible to further describe his linguistic picture of the world and study other important concepts for him. It seems very promising to study the linguistic identity of Boris Johnson on the basis of his journalistic articles and to compare the results obtained with the results of our research.

## REFERENCES

1. Аникин Д.В. Исследование языковой личности составителя “Повести временных лет”. Дис...к. филол. наук. Барнаул, 2004.
2. Асташова О.И. Речевой портрет политика как динамический феномен. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук, Екатеринбург, 2013.
3. Берестнев Г.И. Самосознание личности в зеркале языка: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. М., 2000. 50 с.
4. Беспмятнова Г.Н. Языковая личность телевизионного ведущего: дис. ...к. филол.наук. Воронеж, 1994. – 217 с.
5. Богин Г.И. Модель языковой личности и её отношение к разновидностям текстов : автореф. дис. на соискание учен. степени доктора филол. наук : спец. 10.02.19 «Общее языкознание, социолингвистика, психолингвистика». Ленинград. гос. ун-т, 1984. 31 с.
6. Бурмакина Н.А. Лингвокогнитивный и прагматический уровни языковой личности А.П. Степанова: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.01. Тюмень, 2007. 21 с.
7. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. М.: Русские словари, 1996. 416 с.
8. Виноградов В. В. Проблема авторства и теория стилей. М.: Художественная литература, 1961. 612 с.
9. Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды: о языке художественной прозы. М.: Наука, 1980. 360 с.
10. Воркачев С.Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. Филологические науки. 2001, № 1. С. 64-72.

11. Голев Н.Д., Сайкова Н.В. Лингвоперсонология: проблемы и перспективы. Вопросы лингвоперсонологии: Межвуз. сб. научн. трудов. Ч. 1. Барнаул, 2007. С. 7-11.
12. Горицька Ю. В. Дослідження вторинної мовної особистості в сучасній лінгвістиці. Наукові записки. Серія : Філологічні науки (мовознавство) : [зб. наук. пр.] / [відп. ред. Семенюк О.А.]. Кіровоград : РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2012. Вип. 105 (2). С. 434-438.
13. Горицька Ю. В. Засоби вираження вторинної мовної особистості в англomовному художньому дискурсі. Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету ім. Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Мовознавство : [наук. журнал] / [відп. ред. Данилюк Н.О.]. Луцьк : СНУ ім. Лесі Українки, 2013. № 18 (267). С. 157-161.
14. Горицька Ю. В. Міждисциплінарний характер категорії мовна особистість. Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологічна» : [зб. наук. пр.] / [гол. ред. Пасічник І.Д.]. Острог: Вид-во Нац. ун-ту «Острозька академія», 2013. Вип. 33. С. 40-43.
15. Демидова Дарья Григорьевна Лингвокультурный типаж избирателя в политическом дискурсе: дис. ... канд. фил. наук : 10.02.19. Московский государственный институт международных отношений (университет). Москва, 2017. 143с.
16. Дорожкина Т.Н. Речевой имидж политического лидера. Социальные исследования, 1997, № 8. С. 41-49.
17. Дружинина В.В., Ворожбитова А.А. Лингвориторические параметры идиостиля как выражение менталитета языковой личности ученого (А.Ф. Лосев). Монография. М.: Флинта, 2014. 147 с.

18. Залевская А.А. Специфика единиц и механизмов индивидуального лексикона. Психолингвистические исследования значения слова и понимания текста. Калинин, 1988. С. 5-15.
19. Иванцова Е. В. О термине «языковая личность»: истоки, проблемы, перспективы использования. Вестник Томского государственного университета. Филология 2010. №4 (12). С.24-32.
20. Иванцова Е.В. Лингвоперсонология: Основы теории языковой личности: учеб. пособие. Томск: Изд-во Том. ун-та, 2010. 160 с.
21. Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативный портрет языковой личности (на примере писем Сергея Довлатова). Русистика сегодня. 2000. № 1-4. С. 63-75.
22. Каракуц-Бородина Л.А. Языковая личность Владимира Набокова как автора художественного текста. Уфа: РИО БашГУ, 2003. 192 с.
23. Карасик В.И., Язык социального статуса. М.: Институт языкознания РАН; Волгогр. гос. пед. ин-т, 1992. 330 с.
24. Карасик В.И. Оценочная мотивировка, статус лица и словарная личность // Филология. Краснодар, 1994. С. 2-7.
25. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. – 477 с.
26. Караулов Ю. Н. Русская языковая личность и задачи ее изучения. Язык и личность : сб. науч. тр. / гл. ред. Д. Н. Шмелев. М. : Наука, 1989. С. 3-8.
27. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. 5-е изд., стереотипное. М.: КомКнига, 2006. 264 с.
28. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. М.: «Наука», 1987. 264 с.

29. Китайгородская М.В., Розанова Н.Н. Русский речевой портрет. М.: Наука, 1995. 128 с.
30. Клобукова Л.П. Структура языковой личности на разных этапах ее формирования. Язык, сознание, коммуникация: сборник статей. М.: Филология. Вып. 2. 1997. С. 70-77.
31. Кочеткова Т.В. Языковая личность носителя элитарной речевой культуры (социолингвистический аспект). Языковая личность: социолингвистические и эмотивные аспекты. Волгоград-Саратов, 1998. С. 20-28.
32. Кравцова Ю. В. Метафорическое моделирование мира в художественном тексте: семантикокогнитивный анализ. К. : Изд-во НПУ им. М. П. Драгоманова, 2014. 320 с.
33. Красных В.В. Виртуальная реальность или реальная виртуальность? (Человек, сознание, коммуникация). Диалог-МГУ, 1998. 352 с.
34. Крысин Л.П. К социологическому изучению современного русского литературного языка. Очерки по социолингвистике. Шадринск, 1971. С. 64-86.
35. Кудинова Т.А. Просторечие и диалект в языке А.П. Чехова (к характеристике языковой личности писателя): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Краснодар, 2000. 24 с.
36. Кузьмина Н. А. Интертекстуальный компонент в структуре языковой личности. Язык. Человек. Картина мира : материалы Всерос. науч. конф. / [ред. М. П. Одинцова и др.] : в 2 ч. Ч. 1. Омск : Изд-во ОмГУ, 2000. С. 56–64.

37. Лебедева С.В. Психолингвистическое исследование близости слов в индивидуальном сознании: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. Наук. Саратов, 1991. 16 с.
38. Лемяскина Н. А. Развитие языковой личности и ее коммуникативного сознания: дис.... д.филол.наук. Воронеж, 2004.
39. Летова А.Д. Лингвокультурологический концепт «Английская национальная личность» в сопоставительно-контрастивном описании афористики: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2004. 19 с.
40. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ.высш.учеб. заведений. М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. 208 с.
41. Михайлова М.Д. Политическое лидерство в современной России: сущность, особенности, портреты лидеров. Автореф. дис. ...канд.полит.наук. М., 2001.
42. Мыскин С.В. Теоретико-методологические аспекты теории языковой профессиональной личности. Вестник РУДН: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. М.: РУДН, 2015. № 1. С. 62-75.
43. Нерознак В.П. Лингвистическая персонология: к определению статуса дисциплины. Язык. Поэтика. Перевод. Сб. науч. тр. М.: МГЛУ, 1996. С. 112-116.
44. Нефедова Л. А. Роль СМИ в создании портрета языковой личности политика (на материале французской прессы). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2012. № 5 (259). С. 109-112.
45. Ничипорович Е.А. Кооперативная языковая личность в открытом коммуникативном эпизоде: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 1999. 22 с.

46. Оленёв С.В. Моделирование динамики русской языковой личности. Томск: Изд-во Томского гос. пед. ун-та, 2008. 246 с.
47. Островская Т.А. Дискурсообразующие концепты современной меритократической элиты Британии и Ирландии. Политическая лингвистика. 2014. № 2. С. 173-179.
48. Панченко О.Н. Виктор Шкловский: текст – миф – реальность (к проблеме литературной и языковой личности): автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. М., 1998. 41с.
49. Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. М.: АСТ: Восток Запад, 2010. 314 с.
50. Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Понятие «концепт» в лингвистических исследованиях. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 2000. 30 с.
51. Прохоров Ю.Е. Коммуникативное пространство речевой личности. Виноградовские чтения: когнитивные и культурологические подходы к языковой семантике. М.: 1999. С. 40-45.
52. Седов К. Ф. Становление структуры устного дискурса как выражение эволюции языковой личности: дис. на соискание... д.филол.наук. Саратов, 1999. 436 с.
53. Синица И. А. Языковая личность ученого-гуманитария XIX в. К. : Изд. дом Д. Бураго, 2006. – 350 с.
54. Синиця І.А. Мовна особистість автора у науково-гуманітарному тексті XIX століття (комунікативний, культурологічний, образно-стилістичний аспекти) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філол. наук : спец. 10.02.02 «Російська мова». НАН України. Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні. К., 2007. 36 с.

55. Снитко Е.С. Коммуникативная стратегия поощрения и речевые тактики ее реализации. Русистика. Вып. 7. К. : Киев. нац. ун-т, 2007. С. 18-25.
56. Трубецкой Н.С. К проблеме русского самопознания. Вавилонская башня-2: Слово. Текст. Культура. Чтения 2002-2003. М.: МГЛУ, 2003. С. 7-12.
57. Хлупина М.А. Особенности языковой личности С.Д. Довлатова: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.01. М., 2015. 25 с.
58. Цуцьева М.Г. Языковая личность как субъект политического дискурса. Проблемы языкознания и теории коммуникации. ГРНТИ, 2013. С. 104-108.
59. Чудинов А.П., Будаев Э.В. Дискурсивное исследование политической коммуникации в зарубежной лингвистике. Вестник Тюменского государственного университета. Гуманитарные исследования. Humanitates. 2008. № 1. С. 82-90.
60. Шаховский В.И., Желтухина М.Р. Роль комического в дискурсивном портрете политика (разоблачительная функция языка). Политический дискурс в России-3. Материалы рабочего совещания-семинара. 1999. С.104-114.
61. Шевченко І.С. Когнітивно-прагматичні дослідження дискурсу. Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен : кол. монографія ; [під заг. ред. І.С. Шевченко]. Харків : Константа, 2005. С. 233-236.
62. Шевченко О.Н. Языковая личность переводчика (на материале дискурса Б.В. Заходера): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Волгоград, 2005. 22 с.

63. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. М. : ИТДК «Гнозис», 2004. 326 с.
64. Шустрова Е.В. Сфера-источник «человек» в идиостиле Р. Эллисона. Политическая лингвистика, 2006.
65. Block D. Second Language Identities. Continuum; Illustrated edition, 2009. 240 p.
66. Bucholtz M., Hall K. Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach/ Discourse Studies. Vol. 7. № 4-5. 2005. 585 – 614 p.
67. Campbell R., Wales R. The Study of Language Acquisition. New Horizons in Linguistics / J. Lyons (ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970. P. 242-262.
68. Canale, M., & Swain, M. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. Applied Linguistics, 1980. P. 1-47.
69. Chilton P. Discourse and Politics P. Chilton, Ch. Schäffner. Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol. 2. [ed. by T.A. van Dijk]. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2003. P. 206-230.
70. Dijk T.A. van. The Study of Discourse. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi. 1997. Vol. 1: Discourse as Structure and Process. P. 1–34.
71. Edwards J. Language and Identity: An introduction. Cambridge, 2009. 324 p.
72. Norton B. Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2013. 216 p.

## SUPPORTING MATERIALS

73. Boris Johnson's acceptance speech after being declared mayor of London, 2008 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2008-speech-on-the-fourth-plinth/>
74. Boris Johnson's speech on Making London Safer, 2009 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2009-speech-on-making-london-safer/>
75. Boris Johnsons' first speech as a Prime Minister of the UK, 2019 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2019-speech-on-becoming-prime-minister/>
76. Johnson B. The Churchill Factor: How One Man Made History. Hachette UK, 2014 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=meodAwAAQBAJ&hl=en&pg=GBS.PT13>
77. PM speech to the UN General Assembly: 24 September 2019 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2019-speech-to-un-general-assembly/>
78. Prime Minister Johnson's speech to Conservative conference, 2019 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2019-speech-at-conservative-manifesto-launch/>
79. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Foreign Secretary, at Chatham House on 23 October 2017. [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2017-speech-at-chatham-house/>
80. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Foreign Secretary, at Lancaster House in London on 8 September 2016 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2016-speech-on-peacekeeping/>

81. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Foreign Secretary, at the Conservative Party conference in Manchester on 3 October 2017 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2017-speech-at-conservative-party-conference/>
82. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Foreign Secretary, on 14 February 2018. [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2018-speech-on-brexit/>
83. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Prime Minister, in the House of Commons on 19 October 2019 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2019-statement-on-brexit-2/>
84. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Prime Minister, on 18 January 2021 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2020-statement-on-the-coronavirus/>
85. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Prime Minister, on 19 February 2021 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2021-comments-on-creating-new-vaccines/>
86. The speech made by Boris Johnson, the Prime Minister, on 6 October 2020 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2020-statement-on-leaving-the-european-union/>
87. The speech made by the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, at City Hall in London on 10th May 2012 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2012-speech-at-city-hall/>
88. The speech made by the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, to the 2012 Conservative Party Conference, 2012 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://www.ukpol.co.uk/boris-johnson-2012-conservative-party-conference-speech/>
89. Johnson B. The Spirit of London. HarperCollins UK, 2012 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL:

<https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=ppT9YhSPjwsC&hl=en&pg=GBS.PT127.w.1.3.14>

90. Johnson B. Have I Got Views For You. HarperPerennial UK, 2006 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=hWI7nl3SLL4C&pg=GBS.PP3>
91. Johnson B. Life in the Fast Lane. HarperCollins UK, 2008 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: URL: <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=nnq1fAyIrNYC&pg=GBS.PA25.w.2.0.0.217>